arXiv:0902.2887v1 [math.AG] 17 Feb 2009

Combinatorial resolution of binomial ideals in arbitrary characteristic

Rocío Blanco*

Abstract

In this paper we construct a combinatorial algorithm of resolution of singularities for binomial ideals, over a field of arbitrary characteristic. This algorithm is applied to any binomial ideal. This means ideals generated by binomial equations without any restriction, including monomials and p-th powers, where p is the characteristic of the base field.

In particular, this algorithm works for toric ideals. However, toric geometry tools are not needed, the algorithm is constructed following the same point of view as Villamayor algorithm of resolution of singularities in characteristic zero.

Introduction

The existence of resolution of singularities in arbitrary dimension over a field of characteristic zero was solved by Hironaka in his famous paper [14]. Later on, different constructive proofs have been given, among others, by Villamayor [20], Bierstone-Milman [2], Encinas-Villamayor [10], Encinas-Hauser [9] and Wodarczyk [24].

In positive characteristic, there are some partial results, although the general problem of the existence of resolution of singularities in arbitrary dimension is still open. Recently, the results by Kawanoue [16] and his joint work with Matsuki [17] begin a sequence of four papers promising resolution of singularities in arbitrary characteristic. In [23] Villamayor gives another approach to the existence of resolution of singularities in positive characteristic, using the previous results included in [22] about graded algebras as a new tool to attack this problem. See [11] for its application in the case of characteristic zero. The most recent work by Bravo-Villamayor [6] and Benito-Villamayor [1] gives a new procedure to deal with the case of a singular hypersurface embedded in a smooth scheme of positive characteristic.

In the particular case of binomial ideals, there exist some specific methods of resolution of singularities for binomial varieties with suitable restrictions. In the case of toric ideals (prime binomial ideals), toric geometry tools are often used, such as subdivisions of the associated fan and toric morphisms, to obtain a resolution of singularities. For normal toric varieties over an algebraically closed field of arbitrary characteristic see [18] and [7], and [12] and [19] for non necessarily normal toric varieties.

Bierstone and Milman construct in [3] an algorithm of resolution of singularities, free of characteristic, for reduced binomial ideals with no nilpotent elements. In particular, their algorithm applies to toric ideals. They use Hilbert Samuel function as resolution function, showing that the intersection of the *equimultiple locus* of all the elements of the standard basis of a reduced binomial ideal with no nilpotent elements coincides with its Samuel stratum, see [3] Theorem 7.1. During this

---

*Partially supported by MMT2007-64704.

resolution process p-th powers are never obtained at the transform ideals. In fact, this algorithm can not treat p-th powers of the type $(y^{\gamma}x_1 - bx^{\beta})^{p^s}$.

In this paper we consider binomial ideals without any kind of restriction, and we construct an algorithm of resolution of singularities for these binomial ideals in arbitrary characteristic that provides combinatorial centers of blowing-up. This type of centers preserve the binomial structure of the ideal after blowing-up, what let us ensure the existence of a hypersurface of maximal contact which to make induction on the dimension of the ambient space.

Blowing up only combinatorial centers we obtain a locally monomial ideal as output. We can apply to this kind of binomial ideal some known resolution algorithm to complete the resolution process. Alternatively, we can apply again the same algorithm. If we apply our algorithm again, we can assure to obtain a log-resolution of the beginning ideal and an embedded desingularization of the corresponding binomial variety with good properties.

I thank Santiago Encinas for numerous useful suggestions to improve the presentation of this paper. I am also grateful to Antonio Campillo for his help during all this time.

1 How to read this paper

The construction of the combinatorial algorithm, that is the aim of this article, needs some technical tools of resolution of singularities. For an easier reading, we indicate here what parts can be skipped just to obtain an idea of the running of the algorithm, and to avoid technical details simultaneously.

Notions given in section 2 are easy to read. In section 3 we define the E-order function, in which is based the new resolution function t given in this article.

The resolution function t is given in section 4. The aim of this section is to define the resolution function and to prove its main properties. This makes section 4 the most technical one. However, some parts of this section are necessary to understand the forthcoming results. You can skip subsections 4.4 and 4.5, but to take a look to the other subsections is highly recommended.

Section 5 can also be skipped, since in this section it is given a subroutine of the main combinatorial algorithm 6.4 constructed in the following section 6.

The last section 7 is devoted to prove the most important result of this paper, the theorem of embedded desingularization 7.4.

2 Notation and first definitions

Thereafter, K denotes an algebraically closed field (in particular, we will use K is perfect) of arbitrary characteristic, W will be the regular ambient space.

Let $E = \{V_1, \ldots, V_r\}$ be a simple normal crossing divisor in W. E defines a stratification of W in the following way: we consider the regular closed sets

$$E_{\Lambda} = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} V_{\lambda} \text{ where } \Lambda \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\},$$

by definition $E_{\emptyset} := W$, then each $E^0_{\Lambda} = E_{\Lambda} \setminus ((\cup_{j \notin \Lambda} V_j) \cap E_{\Lambda})$ is locally closed, regular and

$$W = \bigsqcup_{\Lambda} E^0_{\Lambda}.$$

Therefore, for every $\xi \in W$ there exists a unique $\Lambda(\xi) \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that $\xi \in E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)}$.

Remark 2.1. At the beginning of the resolution process $W = Spec(K[x_1, \dots, x_n])$, $dim(W) = n$. Fix the normal crossing divisor $E = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where $V_i = V(x_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, to define a stratification of W.

2.2. Let $J \subset K[x] = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a binomial ideal (generated by monomial and binomial equations). Fixed a monomial ordering in $K[x]$, compute a Gröbner basis of J. It is known that the reduced Gröbner basis of a binomial ideal is binomial, see [8]. The analogous result for standard basis is tested for reduced binomial ideals with no nilpotents in [3].

Therefore, we start with a binomial ideal $J =< f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x) >\subset K[x]$ such that the set of generators $\{f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x)\}$ is the reduced Gröbner basis of J.

After a blowing up $W' \to W$, binomial equations of the type

$$1 - \mu x^{\delta}, \text{ with } \mu \in K, \delta \in \mathbb{N}^n$$

appear naturally in the transform ideal of J. The points $\xi' \in W'$ outside the exceptional divisor where $1 - \mu x^{\delta}$ vanishes, satisfy $x^{\delta}(\xi') \neq 0$. So we are going to work in the localized ring $K[x, y]_y$, where, in what follows, we denote as $y's$ the variables that do not vanish anywhere over $V(J) \cap V(1 - \mu x^{\delta})$.

Remark 2.3. At any stage of the resolution process, $\mathbf{W} = \cup_i U_i$, where $U_i \cong \mathbb{A}^n_K$, is the regular ambient space over K. Inside any chart U_i we consider the open set

$$W = Spec(K[x, y]_y) = Spec(K[x_1, \dots, x_s, y_1, \dots, y_{n-s}]_y) \subset \mathbb{A}^n_K.$$

Definition 2.4. Let $J \subset K[x, y]_y$ be an ideal. We will say J is a *binomial ideal* if it is generated by binomial equations of the type

$$J{=}{<}f_1(x, y), \dots, f_m(x, y){>} \text{ with } f_i(x, y){=}x^{\lambda_i}(1 - \mu_i y^{\delta_i}) \text{ or } f_j(x, y){=}x^{\nu_j}(y^{\gamma_j} x^{\alpha_j} - b_j x^{\beta_j}), \quad (1)$$

with $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $\delta_i, \gamma_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\lambda_i, \nu_j \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\mu_i, b_j \in K$ for every $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. And where, for each j, every equation of the type $y^{\gamma_j} x^{\alpha_j} - b_j x^{\beta_j}$ has no common factors.

Denote $|\alpha_j| = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \alpha_{j,k}$ and $|\beta_j| = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \beta_{j,k}$. Assume $0 < |\alpha_j| \leq |\beta_j|$.

Remark 2.5. Note that the variables y_i, $1 \leq i \leq n - s$, with $\delta_i \neq 0$ are invertible in the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{W,\xi}$, where

$$\xi \in V(1 - \mu y^{\delta}) \subset \bigcap_{\{i|\ \delta_i \neq 0\}} \{y_i \neq 0\}.$$

Definition 2.6. We say $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, are *disjoint* when they satisfy

$$\alpha_l \neq 0 \Rightarrow \beta_l = \gamma_l = 0, \ \beta_m \neq 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_m = \gamma_m = 0, \ \text{ and } \gamma_t \neq 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_t = \beta_t = 0$$

for every $1 \leq l, m, t \leq n$.

That is, in the definition 2.4, $\{\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j\}$ are disjoint. And, $\{\alpha_j, \beta_j, \delta_i\}$ are also disjoint.

Definition 2.7. Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in 2.4. The binomial equations of J of the form $1 - \mu y^{\delta}$, with $\mu \in K$, $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, are said to be *hyperbolic equations* of J.

Notation 2.8. A unique non hyperbolic binomial equation without common factors, will be denoted

$$f(x, y) = y^{\gamma} x^{\alpha} - b x^{\beta} \text{ where } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^n, b \in K \text{ and } 0 < |\alpha| \leq |\beta| \quad (2)$$

$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\beta = (0, \dots, 0, \beta_{k+1}, \dots, \beta_{k+(s-k)}, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\gamma = (0, \dots, 0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-s})$ for some $1 \leq k \leq s$.

We are going to define a modified order function, the E-order, as an order along a normal crossing divisor E. This definition works for any ideal, although we will apply it only to binomial ideals.

Definition 2.9. Let $W = Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ be the regular ambient space. Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in 2.4. Let $E = \{V_1, \ldots, V_n\}$ be a normal crossing divisor in $\mathbb{A}^n_K$. Let $\xi \in W$ be a closed point and let $\Lambda(\xi)$ be a subset of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\xi \in E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)}$. We call *E-order* of J_ξ in $\mathcal{O}_{W,\xi}$ to the order of the ideal with respect to the $I(E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)})_\xi$-adic topology

$$\text{E-ord}_{\mathcal{O}_{W,\xi}}(J_\xi) = \max\left\{m \in \mathbb{N}/\ J_\xi \subset (I(E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)})_\xi)^m\right\}.$$

Definition 2.10. Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in 2.4. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point. The *E-order* function (associated to J) is defined as follows,

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{E-ord}_J: & W \to \mathbb{N} \\ & \xi \to \text{E-ord}_J(\xi) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(J) := \text{E-ord}_{\mathcal{O}_{W,\xi}}(J_\xi) \end{array}$$

The E-order of J at ξ will be denoted $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J)$. The E-order of any binomial equation $f \in J$ at ξ, is defined as the E-order of the ideal $< f >$ at the point ξ.

Remark 2.11. Note that E-ord_J computes the order of the ideal J along $E \cap W$.

Remark 2.12. Observe that the E-order of f is constant along the points $\xi \in E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)}$. Since to compute the E-order are only relevant the coordinates of the point ξ that are contained in some hypersurface $V_j \in E$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

Remark 2.13. Since $E^0_\emptyset = W \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^n V_i \cap W)$ then $I(E^0_\emptyset) = I(W \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^n V_i \cap W)) = < 0 >$. Then for every binomial ideal $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$, $J \neq < 0 >$, and for each point $\xi \in W \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^n V_i \cap W)$ it holds $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) = 0$.

Definition 2.14. An *affine binomial basic object along* E (BBOE) is a tuple $B = (W, (J, c), H, E)$ where

- $W = Spec(K[x,y]_y) = Spec(K[x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-s}]_y) \subset \mathbb{A}^n_K$.
- E is a set of normal crossing regular hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{A}^n_K$, such that

  $$E = \{V(x_1), \ldots, V(x_s), V(y_1), \ldots, V(y_{n-s})\}.$$

  In the open set $Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ we have $E \cap Spec(K[x,y]_y) = \{V(x_1), \ldots, V(x_s)\}$.
- J is a binomial ideal as in (2.4), and c is a positive integer number.
- $H \subset E$ is a set of normal crossing regular hypersurfaces in W.

Definition 2.15. A *non affine binomial basic object along* E is a tuple $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{W}, (\mathcal{J}, c), H, E)$ which is covered by affine BBOE. Where

- $\mathbf{W}$ is the regular ambient space over a field K of arbitrary characteristic.
- E is a set of normal crossing regular hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{W}$.
- $(\mathcal{J}, c)$ is a *binomial pair*, that is, $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{W}}$ is a coherent sheaf of binomial ideals with respect to E, as in 2.4, satisfying $\mathcal{J}_\xi \neq 0$ for each $\xi \in \mathbf{W}$, and c is a positive integer number.

- $H \subset E$ is a set of normal crossing regular hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{W}$.

Remark 2.16. In most cases, we work locally with affine BBOE $(W,(J,c),H,E)$ with the notation introduced in 2.14, without specify that this BBOE is an affine BBOE.

The definition of *E-singular locus* along a normal crossing divisor E is analogous to the usual definition of singular locus.

Definition 2.17. Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be an ideal, c a positive integer. We call *E-singular locus* of J with respect to c to the set,

$$\text{E-Sing}(J,c)=\{\xi \in W/\ \text{E-ord}_\xi(J)\geq c\}.$$

Remark 2.18. Hironaka introduces the notion of equivalence of *pairs* and using this notion, the definition of *idealistic exponent* or *idealistic pair* as an equivalence class of such pairs. See Hironaka [15] for more details.

Definition 2.19. Let W be a regular scheme. Let $\mathcal{J}_1,\mathcal{J}_2$ be coherent ideal sheafs in W and let c_1,c_2 be positive integers. The pair $(\mathcal{J}_1,c_1)$ is said to be *equivalent* to the pair $(\mathcal{J}_2,c_2)$ if for every morphism $h: Spec(A)\rightarrow W$ where (A,ν) is a valuation ring,

$$\frac{\nu(J_1A)}{c_1}=\frac{\nu(J_2A)}{c_2}$$

where J_iA is the ideal in A generated by J_i by means of h.

Therefore, the E-order is well defined in the class of idealistic exponents, with the previous definition of equivalence of pairs.

Remark 2.20. We always consider pairs (J,c) or binomial basic objects $(W,(J,c),H,E)$ along E. This is because of the following result for the order function.

> If the tuples $B=(W,(J,c),E)$ and $B_0=(W,(J_0,c_0),E)$ define the same basic object for a suitable equivalence relation, then for every point $\xi \in \operatorname{Sing}(J,c)=\operatorname{Sing}(J_0,c_0)$,
>
> $$\frac{\operatorname{ord}_\xi(J)}{c}=\frac{\operatorname{ord}_\xi(J_0)}{c_0}.$$
>
> See [15] or [10] for details.

As a consequence, for every point $\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J,c)$, the quotient $\frac{\text{E-ord}_\xi(J)}{c}$ can be defined in terms of the binomial basic object along E, modulo the equivalence relation between idealistic exponents.

Definition 2.21. Let $(W,(J,c),H,E)$ be a BBOE, where $W=Spec(K[x_1,\ldots,x_s,y_1,\ldots,y_{n-s}]_y)$ and $E=\{V(x_1),\ldots,V(x_s),V(y_1),\ldots,\ V(y_{n-s})\}=\{V_1,\ldots,V_n\}$. Let $H=\{H_1,\ldots,H_r\}$ be a normal crossing divisor, $H_i=V(x_j)$ with $1\leq j\leq s$ for each i.

We define a *transformation* of the binomial basic object

$$(W,(J,c),H,E)\leftarrow(W',(J',c),H',E')$$

by means of the blowing up $W \overset{\pi}{\leftarrow} W'$, along a combinatorial center $Z\subset \text{E-Sing}(J,c)$, where W' is the strict transform of W. With

- $H'=\{H_1^{\curlyvee},\ldots,H_r^{\curlyvee},Y'\}$ where $H_i^{\curlyvee}$ is the strict transform of H_i and Y' is the exceptional divisor in W'.

- $E' = \{V_1^\curlyvee, \dots, V_n^\curlyvee, Y'\}$ where $V_i^\curlyvee$ is the strict transform of V_i and Y' is the exceptional divisor in W'.
- $J' = J^! = I(Y')^{\theta - c} \cdot J^\curlyvee$ is the *controlled* transform of J, where $\theta = \max\ \text{E-ord}(J)$ and $J^\curlyvee$ is the weak transform of J.

Remark 2.22. A combinatorial center is given by the intersection of coordinate hypersurfaces defined by x's.

Definition 2.23. A sequence of transformations of binomial basic objects

$$(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \leftarrow (W^{(1)}, (J^{(1)}, c), H^{(1)}, E^{(1)}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow (W^{(N)}, (J^{(N)}, c), H^{(N)}, E^{(N)}) \qquad (3)$$

is a *E-resolution* of $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$ if $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(N)}, c) = \emptyset$.

3 Properties of the E-order function

Definition 3.1. A function $g : X \to (A, \leq)$, where X is a topological noetherian space and A is a totally ordered set, is said to be *upper semi-continuous* if

- $\text{Im}(g) = \{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$ is a finite subset of A.
- The sets $\mathcal{F}_{a_i} = \{\xi \in X /\ g(\xi) \geq a_i\}$ are closed for all $1 \leq i \leq s$.

Remark 3.2. It is very well known that the order function is upper semi-continuous. See for example [10].

Proposition 3.3. *Properties of the E-order function for binomial equations.*

1) Let $f(x, y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - b x^\beta$ be a binomial equation without common factors, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $b \in K$ and $0 < |\alpha| \leq |\beta|$. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point where $y^\gamma(\xi) \neq 0$, then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) \leq \text{ord}_\xi(f)$.

2) Let $f(y) = 1 - \mu y^\delta$ be a hyperbolic equation, $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\mu \in K$. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point where $y^\delta(\xi) \neq 0$, then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = 0 \leq \text{ord}_\xi(f)$.

Proof. It is enough to observe that

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = \text{ord}_{E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)}}(f) \leq ord_\xi(f)$$

by the upper semi-continuity of the order function. Where $\text{ord}_{E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)}}(f)$ means the order of f at the generic point of the stratum $E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)}$.

Note that in case (1), if $\xi_i = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $\alpha_i > 0$ or $\beta_i > 0$, then the equality holds $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = \text{ord}_\xi(f)$. □

Remark 3.4. The above proposition still holds for binomial equations with common factors. Since

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(x^\nu(y^\gamma x^\alpha - b x^\beta)) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(x^\nu) + \text{E-ord}_\xi(y^\gamma x^\alpha - b x^\beta)$$

and

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(x^\lambda(1 - \mu y^\delta)) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(x^\lambda) + \text{E-ord}_\xi(1 - \mu y^\delta) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(x^\lambda)$$

with $\nu, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Note that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(x^\nu) = \text{ord}_\xi(x^\nu)$ for any monomial x^ν, with $\nu \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $\forall\ \xi \in W$.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. Then*

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) \leq \text{ord}_\xi(J)$$

for every $\xi \in W$.

Proof. Let $< f_1, \dots, f_r >$ be a system of generators of J. By the previous proposition $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) \leq \text{ord}_\xi(f_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) \leq \text{ord}_\xi(J)$. ☐

Proposition 3.6. *Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4, $\xi \in W$. Then*

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{E-ord}_J : & W \to (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) \\ & \xi \to \text{E-ord}_J(\xi) := \text{E-ord}_\xi(J) \end{array}$$

is an upper semi-continuous function.

Proof. The subset $\text{Im}(\text{ord}_J) = \{n_1 < \ldots < n_l\}$ is a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}$, since $\text{ord}_J : W \to (\mathbb{Z}, \leq)$ where $\text{ord}_J(\xi) = \text{ord}_\xi(J)$, is an upper semi-continuous function. Moreover, $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) \leq \text{ord}_\xi(J)$ for all $\xi \in W$ because of J is a binomial ideal. Then $\text{Im}(\text{E-ord}_J) = \{m_1 < \ldots < m_s\}$ where $m_s \leq n_l$, $m_1 \geq 0$.

Let $J =< f_1, \dots, f_r >$ be a system of generators of J. The set

$$\mathcal{F}_m(J) = \{\xi \in W / \ \text{E-ord}_J(\xi) \geq m\} = \mathcal{F}_m(f_1) \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{F}_m(f_r).$$

It is enough to check each $\mathcal{F}_m(f_i)$ is a closed set for all $1 \leq i \leq r$:

Assume f_i has no common factors. Remind that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) = \text{ord}_\xi(f_i)$, for all $\xi \in W$, when $f_i(x) = x^\alpha$, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$.

1.a) If $f_i(x, y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta$ is a binomial equation as in equation (2), then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) = \text{ord}_\xi(f_i)$ for every point $\xi \in W$ satisfying $y^\gamma(\xi) \neq 0$ and $\xi_j = 0$ for any $1 \leq j \leq n$ with $\alpha_j > 0$ or $\beta_j > 0$.

In this case, if $m > 0$,

$$\mathcal{F}_m(f_i) = \{\xi \in W / \ \text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) \geq m\} = \{\xi \in W / \ \text{ord}_\xi(f_i) \geq m\} \cap (\cup_i V_i)$$

where $E = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$. Therefore $\mathcal{F}_m(f_i)$ is a closed set since ord_J is an upper semi-continuous function.

1.b) If $f_i(x, y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta$ is a binomial equation as in equation (2), then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) = 0$ for every point $\xi \in W$ satisfying $y^\gamma(\xi) \neq 0$ and $\xi_j \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ with $\alpha_j > 0$ or $\beta_j > 0$.

2) If $f_i(y) = 1 - \mu y^\delta$ is a hyperbolic equation, $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\mu \in K$, then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) = 0$ for every point $\xi \in W$ where $y^\delta(\xi) \neq 0$.

Observe that the points $\xi \in W$ where $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) = 0$ are only included inside the set

$$\mathcal{F}_0(f_i) = \{\xi \in W / \ \text{E-ord}_\xi(f_i) \geq 0\}$$

which is a closed set since $\mathcal{F}_0(f_i) = W$.

Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{m_j}(J)$ is a closed set for all $1 \leq j \leq s$. ☐

Corollary 3.7. *Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. Let c be a positive integer number. Then* $\text{E-Sing}(J, c)$ *is a closed set.*

Definition 3.8. Let t be an upper semi-continuous function in W. The *top locus* of t is the reduced closed subscheme of W where t reaches its maximum value, that is, $top(t) = \{\xi \in W \mid t(\xi) = \max\ t\}$.

Definition 3.9. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a coherent ideal sheaf in W.

- The set $\text{E-top}(\mathcal{J}) = top(\text{E-ord}(\mathcal{J}))$ is said to be the *E-top locus* of $\mathcal{J}$.
- Let c be a positive integer number, $\text{E-top}(\mathcal{J}, c) = \{\xi \in W \mid \text{E-ord}_\xi(\mathcal{J}) \geq c\}$.

In addition, the E-order function is invariant by the torus action.

Remark 3.10. Let φ be the homomorphism of tori

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \varphi: & \mathcal{T}^d & \to & \mathcal{T}^n \\ & t & \to & (t^{a_1}, \ldots, t^{a_n}) \end{array}$$

where $\{a_1 \ldots, a_n\} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

We work with binomial ideals non necessarily toric ideals. Consider the torus action $\mathcal{T}^d$ on $\mathbb{A}^n_K$ given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{T}^d \times \mathbb{A}^n_K & \to & \mathbb{A}^n_K \\ (t, \xi) & \to & (t^{a_1}\xi_1, \ldots, t^{a_n}\xi_n) \end{array} \tag{4}$$

extending the homomorphism φ.

Note that the torus action (4) on $\mathbb{A}^n_K$ induces a torus action on the open subset $Spec(K[x,y]_y) \subset \mathbb{A}^n_K$ given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{T}^d \times Spec(K[x,y]_y) & \to & Spec(K[x,y]_y) \\ (t, \xi) & \to & (t^{a_1}\xi_1, \ldots, t^{a_n}\xi_n) \end{array} \tag{5}$$

Proposition 3.11. *Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in (2.4). Let X be the binomial variety corresponding to the ideal J, where $dim(X) = d$. Then*

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) = \text{E-ord}_{\mathcal{T}^d(\xi)}(J)$$

for all $\xi \in W$, where $\mathcal{T}^d$ is the torus action (5).

Proof. By hypothesis J is given by equations of the form $f(x,y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta$ or $g(y) = (1 - \mu y^\delta)$. Fix $\xi \in W$ such that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = |\alpha|$. Since $\xi \in W$ then $\mathcal{T}^d(\xi) = (t^{a_1}\xi_1, \ldots, t^{a_n}\xi_n) \in W$ therefore

$$f(\mathcal{T}^d(x,y)) = t^{\sum_i a_i\gamma_i} y^\gamma t^{\sum_i a_i\alpha_i} x^\alpha - bt^{\sum_i a_i\beta_i} x^\beta$$

so $\text{E-ord}_{\mathcal{T}^d(\xi)}(f) = |\alpha|$. The E-order remains constant whereas $t_i \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, d$.

Observe that $\text{E-ord}_{\mathcal{T}^d(\xi)}(g) = 0 = \text{E-ord}_\xi(g)$.

This prove the assertion for any generator of J, and therefore for any equation belonging to J. ☐

Remark 3.12. In what follows, an invariant function by the torus action will be called an *equivariant* function.

This modified order function, the E-order, let us to solve the problem of the existence of hypersurfaces of maximal contact in positive characteristic, in the particular case of binomial ideals.

Definition 3.13. Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point such that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) = \max\ \text{E-ord}(J) = \theta$, V is said to be a hypersurface of *maximal contact along E* for J at ξ (denoted by hypersurface of *E-maximal contact*) if

- V is a regular hypersurface, $\xi \in V$,
- E-Sing$(J, \theta) \subseteq V$ and their transforms under blowing up along a center $Z \subset V$ also satisfy E-Sing$(J', \theta) \subseteq V'$, where J' is the controlled transform of J and V' is the strict transform of V.

Remark 3.14. As a consequence, if V is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for J and we have a sequence of blow ups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (W, J) & \xleftarrow{\pi_1} & (W^{(1)}, J^{(1)}) & \xleftarrow{\pi_2} & \cdots & \xleftarrow{\pi_N} & (W^{(N)}, J^{(N)}) \\ Z \subset V & & Z^{(1)} \subset V^{(1)} & & & & Z^{(N)} \subset V^{(N)} \end{array}$$

with centers $Z^{(i)} \subset V^{(i)}$, where $V^{(i)}$ is the strict transform of $V^{(i-1)}$, satisfying

$$\text{E-ord}_{\xi}(J) = \max_{\pi_1(\xi^{(1)}) = \xi} \text{E-ord}(J), \ \text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(1)}}(J^{(1)}) = \max_{\pi_2(\xi^{(2)}) = \xi^{(1)}} \text{E-ord}(J^{(1)}), \ldots, \ \text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(N)}}(J^{(N)}) = \max_{\pi_N(\xi^{(N)}) = \xi^{(N-1)}} \text{E-ord}(J^{(N)})$$

and

$$\max \ \text{E-ord}(J) = \max \ \text{E-ord}(J^{(1)}) = \cdots = \max \ \text{E-ord}(J^{(N)}) = \theta$$

then

$$\text{E-Sing}(J^{(1)}, \theta) \subseteq V^{(1)}, \ldots, \text{E-Sing}(J^{(N)}, \theta) \subseteq V^{(N)}.$$

The strict transforms of V preserve this property while the maximum E-order remains constant.

Definition 3.15. Let f be a binomial equation in $\mathcal{O}_W$. Let $a \in W$ be a point. The *equimultiple locus of a along E* for f is the set of points where f has the same E-order as at the point a

$$S_{f,E}(a) = \{\xi \in W \mid \text{E-ord}_{\xi}(f) = \text{E-ord}_a(f)\}.$$

Theorem 3.16. *Let $f(x, y) = y^{\gamma} x^{\alpha} - b x^{\beta} \in K[x, y]_y$ be a binomial equation as in equation (2). Let $a \in Spec(K[x, y]_y)$ be a point satisfying $a_i = 0$ for all i with $\alpha_i > 0$, $y^{\gamma}(a) \neq 0$ and* E-ord$_a(f) = |\alpha|$.

If $|\alpha| > 0$ then

$$S_{f,E}(a) \subset \bigcap_{\{i \mid \ \alpha_i > 0\}} \{x_i = 0\}.$$

Proof. Let $\xi \in S_{f,E}(a)$ be a point verifying $y^{\gamma}(\xi) \neq 0$, E-ord$_{\xi}(f) = |\alpha|$. Suppose $\alpha_i > 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. If $\xi \notin \{x_1 = \ldots = x_k = 0\}$ then $\xi_i \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let assume ξ verifies $\xi_k \neq 0$, $\xi_1 = \ldots = \xi_{k-1} = 0$.

The E-order can be computed in terms of the exponents, E-ord$_{\xi}(f) = min\{|\alpha|_{\xi}, |\beta|_{\xi}\}$ where

$$|\alpha|_{\xi} = \sum_{\{i \mid \ \xi_i = 0, \alpha_i > 0\}} \alpha_i \text{ and } |\beta|_{\xi} = \sum_{\{i \mid \ \xi_i = 0, \beta_i > 0\}} \beta_i.$$

If $\xi_k \neq 0$ then E-ord$_{\xi}(f) \leq \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_{k-1} < |\alpha|$, that is, by definition of E-order,

$$< f >_{\xi} \subset (I(E^0_{\Lambda(\xi)})_{\xi})^{|\alpha| - \alpha_k} = < x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+i_1}, \ldots, x_{k+i_s} >^{|\alpha| - \alpha_k}$$

but

$$< f >_{\xi} \not\subset < x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+i_1}, \ldots, x_{k+i_s} >^{|\alpha|}$$

for i_j such that $\beta_{i_j} > 0$ and $\xi_{i_j} = 0$ for each $1 \leq j \leq s$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i_j} \geq |\alpha|$, contradiction.

In the same way, if $\xi_1 = \ldots = \xi_l = 0$ and $\xi_j \neq 0$ for all $l + 1 \leq j \leq k$ then E-ord$_{\xi}(f) = |\alpha| - \sum_{j=l+1}^{k} \alpha_j$, contradiction.

If $\xi_j \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$, then E-ord$_{\xi}(f) = 0$ contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 3.17. *Let $J \subset K[x,y]_y$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. Let $\xi \in Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ be a point where* $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) = \theta > 0$ *is maximal. Let $f \in J$ be a binomial equation such that* $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = \theta$ *and f satisfies the hypothesis of the Theorem 3.16. Then in a neighborhood of ξ,*

$$\text{E-Sing}(J, \theta) \subseteq \{x_i = 0\} \textit{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

Proof. It is enough to observe that $\text{E-Sing}(J, \theta) \subseteq S_{f,E}(\xi)$. □

Remark 3.18. As a consequence, the hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact will always be given by coordinate equations. The existence of these hypersurfaces will be proved in lemma 4.31. Hence the centers of blowing up will always be combinatorial.

4 E-resolution function

4.1 Induction on the dimension

In this section we rewrite *mobiles language* in order to use this language with the E-order function, and to make induction on the dimension of the ambient space. See [9] for more details.

Given $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ a binomial basic object along E, by induction on the dimension of W, construct ideals J_i defined in local flags $W = W_n \supseteq W_{n-1} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq W_i \supseteq \cdots \supseteq W_1$, and then binomial basic objects $(W_i, (J_i, c_{i+1}), H_i, E_i)$ in dimension i, where each $E_i = W_i \cap E$.

Remark 4.1. If $\text{E-Sing}(J_i, c_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ then factorize the ideal $J_i = M_i \cdot I_i$, where each ideal M_i is defined by a normal crossings divisor D_i supported by the current exceptional locus.

In what follows we will define the ideals J_{i-1}, $n \geq i > 1$. We need the auxiliary definition of the companion ideals P_i.

Definition 4.2. Let $J_i = M_i \cdot I_i$ be an ideal in W_i at $\xi \in W_i$. Set $\theta_i = \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i)$. The *companion ideal* of J_i at ξ, with respect to the critical value c_{i+1} satisfying $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J_i) \geq c_{i+1}$, is the ideal

$$P_i = \begin{cases} I_i & \text{if } \ \theta_i \geq c_{i+1} \\ I_i + M_i^{\overline{\frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}-\theta_i}}} & \text{if } \ 0 < \theta_i < c_{i+1} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.3. If $\theta_i = 0$ but $\text{ord}_\xi(I_i) \neq 0$ then there exists some hyperbolic equation belonging to the ideal I_i. In this case, the ideal $I_i \neq 1$ but it will be treated as $I_i \equiv 1$, since J_i behaves like a monomial ideal with respect to the E-order. So, in this situation, $J_i \equiv M_i$.

Remark 4.4. On one hand, the weight assigned to the ideal M_i ensures that $\text{E-ord}(P_i) = \text{E-ord}(I_i)$ along the points of maximal E-order, where $\text{E-top}(P_i) \subset \text{E-top}(I_i)$. So $P_i = 1$ if and only if $I_i = 1$ or $I_i \equiv 1$. On the other hand,

$$\text{E-top}(P_i) = \text{E-top}(I_i) \cap \text{E-top}(M_i, c_{i+1} - \theta_i) \subset \text{E-top}(J_i, c_{i+1})$$

what ensures $\text{E-Sing}(P_i, \theta_i) \subset \text{E-Sing}(J_i, c_{i+1})$ when $0 < \theta_i < c_{i+1}$.

Remark 4.5. In addition, this weight guarantees the weak transform of P_i by a blow up π satisfies

$$P_i^{\curlyvee} = (I_i + M_i^{\overline{\frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}-\theta_i}}})^{\curlyvee} = I_i^{\curlyvee} + (M_i')^{\overline{\frac{\theta_i'}{c_{i+1}'-\theta_i'}}}$$

when $\theta_i' = \theta_i$ and $c_{i+1}' = c_{i+1}$, where $\theta_i' = \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I_i')$ in a neighborhood of the point ξ' such that $\pi(\xi') = \xi$.

Definition 4.6. Let J_i be an ideal in W_i at $\xi \in W_i$. Let P_i be the companion ideal of J_i in a neighborhood of the point ξ with respect to the critical value c_{i+1}.

The critical value c_i corresponding to dimension $i-1$ is $c_i = \text{E-ord}_\xi(P_i)$.

Definition 4.7. Let P be an ideal in W, let $V \subset W$ be a regular hypersurface, and let $\xi \in V$ be a point. Let $\{z, w\}$ be a regular system of parameters of $\mathcal{O}_{W,\xi}$ and let $\{w\}$ be a regular system of parameters of $\mathcal{O}_{V,\xi}$ such that $\{z=0\}$ defines V in W.

For all $f \in P$, let $f = \sum_\alpha a_{f,\alpha} z^\alpha$ be its Taylor expansion with respect to the equation defining V, so that $a_{f,\alpha} \in \mathcal{O}_{V,\xi}$ and this equality holds after passage to the completion.

The *coefficient ideal of P along E* at ξ with respect to V is the ideal

$$\text{E-Coeff}_V(P) =< \text{E-Coeff}_V(f), f \in P >= \sum_{f \in P, |\alpha|<c} (a_{f,\alpha})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}|\alpha|}}$$

where c is the suitable critical value.

Remark 4.8. To avoid rational exponents take $\frac{c!}{c\text{-}|\alpha|}$ instead of $\frac{c}{c\text{-}|\alpha|}$ in the previous definition.

The pair $(\mathbf{E\text{-}Coeff}_V(P), c!)$ whose exponents are integer numbers is equivalent to the pair $(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P), c)$ with rational exponents.

Proposition 4.9. *Let P be an ideal in W, let $V \subset W$ be a regular hypersurface. Then*

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P)) \geq \text{E-ord}_\xi(P) \tag{6}$$

for all point $\xi \in V$.

Proof. Let $\xi \in V$ be a point. Set $c = \text{E-ord}_\xi(P)$. This means $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) \geq c$ for all $f \in P$, so that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(a_{f,\alpha}) \geq c - |\alpha|$ for all $f \in P$.

Then

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi\left((a_{f,\alpha})^{\frac{c}{c-|\alpha|}}\right) \geq (c-|\alpha|) \cdot \left(\frac{c}{c-|\alpha|}\right) \quad \text{for all } f \in P,$$

therefore

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P)) = \min_{\forall f \in P}\left(\text{E-ord}_\xi\left(\sum_{|\alpha|<c} (a_{f,\alpha})^{\frac{c}{c-|\alpha|}}\right)\right) \geq c.$$

□

Remark 4.10. Let P be a binomial ideal in W. Every hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P at any point $a \in W$ is achieved by Theorem 3.16.

Under these conditions, if $\{x_1 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P at a, then there exists a binomial equation $f(x,y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - b x^\beta \in P$ with $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $\text{E-ord}_a(f) = |\alpha| = \text{E-ord}_a(P)$, and therefore $\{x_1 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for f.

Lemma 4.11. *Let P be a binomial ideal in W. If $\{x_1 = 0\}, \{x_2 = 0\}$ are hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact for P in a neighborhood of $a \in W$, then,*

a) The hypersurface $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)$. *Analogously, $\{x_1 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for* $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(P)$.

b) $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}\left(\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)\right) = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}\left(\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(P)\right)$.

Proof.

a) Fix $c = \max$ E-ord(P). Let $a \in W$ be a point where E-ord$_a(P) = c$. Let $f \in P$ be a binomial equation, without common factors, such that E-ord$_a(f) = c$ and $\{x_1 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for f at a.

- If $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is also a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for f at a then there are two cases:
  - If f is of the form $f(x, y) = y^\gamma x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} x^{\alpha *} - bx^\beta$, with $\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0$, $\alpha * = \alpha - (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0 \ldots, 0)$ and $c = |\alpha| \geq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. The coefficient ideal of $< f >$ along E is,

    $$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(< f >) =< (y^\gamma x_2^{\alpha_2} x^{\alpha *})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\alpha_1}}, bx^\beta > .$$

    Since $|\beta| \geq |\alpha| = c$, E-ord$_a$(E-Coeff$_{\{x_1=0\}}(< f >)) = |\alpha| = c$ and therefore

    $$\text{E-ord}_a(\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)) = |\alpha| = c.$$

    So that $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for E-Coeff$_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)$ at a.
  - If f is of the form $f(x, y) = y^\gamma x_1^{\alpha_1} x^{\alpha *} - bx_2^{\beta_2} x^{\beta *}$, with $\alpha * = \alpha - (\alpha_1, 0 \ldots, 0)$, $\beta * = \beta - (0, \beta_2, 0 \ldots, 0)$, $\alpha_1 > 0, \beta_2 > 0$ and $c = |\alpha| = |\beta|$. The coefficient ideal of $< f >$ along E is,

    $$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(< f >) = \begin{cases} < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha *})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\alpha_1}}, bx_2^{\beta_2} x^{\beta *} > & \text{if } \alpha_1 < c \\ < bx_2^{\beta_2} x^{\beta *} > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = c \end{cases}$$

    Again E-ord$_a$(E-Coeff$_{\{x_1=0\}}(< f >)) = |\alpha| = c$ so that $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for E-Coeff$_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)$ at a.

- If $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is not a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for f at a, then there exists a binomial equation $g \in P$ such that E-ord$_a(g) = c$ and $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for g at a. This equation g is of the form $g(x, y) = y^\delta x_2^{\eta_2} x^{\eta *} - bx^\mu$, without common factors, where $\eta * = \eta - (0, \eta_2, 0 \ldots, 0)$, $\eta_1 + \eta_2 \leq |\eta|$ and $c = |\eta| \leq |\mu|$. The coefficient ideal of $< g >$ along E is,

  $$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(< g >) = \begin{cases} < g > & \text{if } \eta_1 = \mu_1 = 0 \\ < (y^\delta x_2^{\eta_2} x^{\eta^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\eta_1}}, bx^\mu > & \text{if } \eta_1 > 0 \\ < y^\delta x_2^{\eta_2} x^{\eta *}, (bx^{\mu *})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\mu_1}} > & \text{if } 0 < \mu_1 < c \\ < y^\delta x_2^{\eta_2} x^{\eta *} > & \text{if } \mu_1 \geq c \end{cases}$$

  where $\eta^{**} = \eta^* - (\eta_1, 0 \ldots, 0)$, $\mu^* = \mu - (\mu_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

  So that E-ord$_a$(E-Coeff$_{\{x_1=0\}}(< g >)) = |\eta| = c$ and therefore $\{x_2 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for E-Coeff$_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)$ at a.

- To check the assumption when f has common factors is an easy exercise.

b) It is enough to check

$$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}\big(\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(<f>)\big) = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}\big(\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(<f>)\big) \ \forall \ f \in P.$$

In (a) it is proved that the equality in equation (6) holds if there exist at least two hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact for P at $a \in W$.

Let $f(x, y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta$ be a binomial equation, $f \in P$, with $|\beta| \geq |\alpha|$, where $|\alpha| \geq c$.

- Assume $\alpha_1 < c$. The coefficient ideal of $< f >$ along E is given by,

$$J_f^1 = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(< f >) = \begin{cases} < f > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \beta_1 = 0 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^*} - bx^{\beta^*})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\alpha_1}} > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \beta_1 \neq 0 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^*})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\alpha_1}}, (bx^{\beta^*})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\beta_1}} > & \text{if } 0 < \beta_1 < c,\ \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^*})^{\frac{c}{c\text{-}\alpha_1}} > & \text{if } \beta_1 \geq c \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha^* = \alpha - (\alpha_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $\beta^* = \beta - (\beta_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$.
Note that $\max\ \text{E-ord}(J_f^1) \geq c$, but $\max\ \text{E-ord}(\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(P)) = c$ because of (a).
Notice that $\alpha_1 < c$ and $\alpha_2 \cdot \frac{c}{c-\alpha_1} < c$ are equivalent to $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 < c$.
Since $\frac{c}{c-\alpha_1} \cdot \frac{c}{c-(\frac{\alpha_2 \cdot c}{c-\alpha_1})} = \frac{c}{c-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}$ and $\frac{c}{c-\beta_1} \cdot \frac{c}{c-(\frac{\beta_2 \cdot c}{c-\beta_1})} = \frac{c}{c-(\beta_1+\beta_2)}$,

$$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(J_f^1) = \begin{cases} < f > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \beta_1 = \alpha_2 = \beta_2 = 0 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha'} - bx^{\beta'})^{\frac{c}{c-\alpha_2}} > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \beta_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = \beta_2 \neq 0 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^{**}} - bx^{\beta^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}} > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \beta_1 \neq 0, \alpha_2 = \beta_2 \neq 0 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^*} - bx^{\beta^*})^{\frac{c}{c-\alpha_1}} > & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \beta_1 \neq 0, \alpha_2 = \beta_2 = 0 \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}}, (bx^{\beta^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c-(\beta_1+\beta_2)}} > & \text{if } \begin{matrix} 0 < \beta_1 + \beta_2 < c, \\ \beta_1 \neq \alpha_1 \text{ or } \beta_2 \neq \alpha_2 \end{matrix} \\ < (y^\gamma x^{\alpha^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}} > & \text{if } \beta_1 \geq c \text{ or } \beta_2 \geq c \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha^{**} = \alpha - (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $\beta^{**} = \beta - (\beta_1, \beta_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $\alpha^{'} = \alpha - (0, \alpha_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and $\beta^{'} = \beta - (0, \beta_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$.
Replacing x_1 by x_2, α_1 by α_2 and β_1 by β_2 in the expression of J_f^1 obtain

$$J_f^2 = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(< f >).$$

It follows that $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(J_f^2) = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(J_f^1)$.

- If $\alpha_1 \geq c$,

$$J_f^1 = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(< f >) = \begin{cases} < (bx^{\beta^*})^{\frac{c}{c-\beta_1}} > & \text{if } \beta_1 < c \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta_1 \geq c \end{cases}$$

where $\beta^* = \beta - (\beta_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. The exponent of x_2, $\beta_2 \cdot \frac{c}{c-\beta_1} < c$ if and only if $\beta_1 + \beta_2 < c$.
As above

$$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(J_f^1) = \begin{cases} < (bx^{\beta^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c-(\beta_1+\beta_2)}} > & \text{if } \beta_1 < c, \beta_1 + \beta_2 < c \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with $\beta^{**} = \beta - (\beta_1, \beta_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$. And

$$\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(J_f^2) = \begin{cases} < (bx^{\beta^{**}})^{\frac{c}{c-(\beta_1+\beta_2)}} > & \text{if } \beta_2 < c, \beta_1 + \beta_2 < c \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

so that $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_1=0\}}(J_f^2) = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(J_f^1)$.

- Following the previous argument, compute $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(J_f^1)$ when $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq c$. In this case $\alpha_2 \cdot \frac{c}{c-\alpha_1} \geq c$ and the coefficient ideals are the same as in the case $\alpha_1 \geq c$. $\square$

Proposition 4.12. *Let P be an ideal in W. Let $V = \{z = 0\} \subset W$ be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P at $\xi \in V$. Fix $c = \text{E-ord}_\xi(P) = \max\ \text{E-ord}(P)$. Then,*

$$\text{E-top}(P) = \text{E-top}(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P), c).$$

Proof. By proposition 4.9 $\text{E-top}(P) \subset \text{E-top}(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P), c)$.

Let $\eta \in V$ such that $\eta \in \text{E-top}(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P), c)$. By definition,

$$\text{E-Coeff}_V(P) =< \{(a_{f,\alpha})^{\frac{c}{c-|\alpha|}}\ /\ f \in P, |\alpha| < c\} >$$

where $V = \{z = 0\}$ and $f = \sum_\alpha a_{f,\alpha} z^\alpha$, $\forall\ f \in P$.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{E-ord}_\eta(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P)) \geq c\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{E-ord}_\eta((a_{f,\alpha})^{\frac{c}{c-|\alpha|}}) \geq c,\ \forall\ f \in P \text{ and } \ \forall\ |\alpha| < c \Leftrightarrow \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{E-ord}_\eta(a_{f,\alpha}) \geq c - |\alpha|,\ \forall\ f \in P \text{ and } \ \forall\ |\alpha| < c \Leftrightarrow \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{E-ord}_\eta(f) \geq c,\ \forall\ f \in P\end{aligned}$$

because of $\text{E-Sing}(f, c) \subset V$.

Since c is maximum, $\text{E-ord}_\eta(f) = c$ for all $f \in P$ and then $\eta \in \text{E-top}(P)$. ☐

Proposition 4.13. *Let P be an ideal in W. Let $V \subset W$ be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P at $\xi \in V$. The coefficient ideal of P along E satisfies*

$$(\text{E-Coeff}_V(P))^! = \text{E-Coeff}_{V^\curlyvee}(P^\curlyvee)$$

after a blow up π along $Z \subset \text{E-top}(P)$, at those points where

$$c' = \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P^\curlyvee) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(P) = c,$$

with $\pi(\xi') = \xi$, $P^\curlyvee$ is the weak transform of P and the superscript $^!$ means controlled transform.

Proof. The proof is word by word the same as in [9] rewritten for the E-order. ☐

Definition 4.14. Let $P \neq 0$ be an ideal in a hypersurface $V = \{x_1 = 0\} \subset W = Spec(K[x, y]_y)$. The ideal P is said to be *bold regular along E* or *E-bold regular* if P is of the form $P =< y^\gamma(1 - \mu y^\delta)x_1^{\alpha_1} >$ where $\mu \in K$, $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_1 > 0$.

Remark 4.15. The factor $y^\gamma(1 - \mu y^\delta)$ satisfies

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(y^\gamma(1 - \mu y^\delta)) = 0 \text{ for all } \xi \in V \cap \{\eta \in W |\ y^\gamma(\eta) \neq 0, y^\delta(\eta) \neq 0\}.$$

Proposition 4.16. *Let $P \neq 0$ be an ideal in W. Let $V \subset W$ be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P in a neighborhood of $\xi \in V$, with* $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P) = c$.

Then $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P) = 0$ *if and only if P is bold regular or* 1.

Proof.

- If the ideal P is bold regular, $P =< y^\gamma(1 - \mu y^\delta)x_1^{\alpha_1} >$. Then $\text{E-top}(P) = V = \{x_1 = 0\}$ and $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P) = 0$. If $P = 1$ then there no exists any hypersurface V of maximal contact for P, $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P) = 0$ by definition.
- If $V = \{x_1 = 0\}$, $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P) = 0$ and $P \neq 1$ then the coefficients $a_{f,\alpha} = 0$ for all $f \in P$ where $f = \sum_{\{\alpha/|\alpha|<c\}} a_{f,\alpha} x_1^\alpha$. So $P \subset< x_1^c >$.

  Since $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P) = c$ at $\xi \in V$, then $P =< \mathcal{U} \cdot x_1^c >$ where $\text{E-ord}_\xi(\mathcal{U}) = 0$. Therefore $\mathcal{U}$ is of the form $\mathcal{U} = y^\gamma(1 - \mu y^\delta)$ with $y^\gamma(\xi) \neq 0$, $y^\delta(\xi) \neq 0$, $\mu \in K$, $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

$\square$

Definition 4.17. Let P_i be an ideal in W_i. Let $V \subset W_i$ be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P_i at $\xi \in V$. Denote $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P_i) = c_i$. The *junior ideal* of P_i in V is the ideal

$$J_{i-1} = \begin{cases} \text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i) & \text{if } \text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i) \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i) = 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i)$ is the coefficient ideal of P_i along E in V.

Remark 4.18. Let P be a binomial ideal in W. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point. Let $V \subset W$ be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P at $\xi \in V$. By construction, the junior ideal of P in V can be expressed in terms of binomials. This means it is locally generated by binomials or their powers.

Remark 4.19. Let Z be the next center to be blown up, defined by this inductive procedure: choice in W_i of a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P_i by means of theorem 3.16 and computation of the junior ideal J_{i-1} inside this hypersurface. Then, by construction

$$Z = \cap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \{x_i = 0\} \text{ with } \mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

4.2 Definition and properties of the E-resolution function

Definition 4.20. Let $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ be a binomial basic object along E. For all point $\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J, c)$ the E-resolution function t will have n components with lexicographical order, and it will be of one of the following types:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (a) & t(\xi) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \ldots, t_{n-r}(\xi),\ \infty,\ \infty, \ldots, \infty) \\ (b) & t(\xi) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \ldots, t_{n-r}(\xi), \Gamma(\xi), \infty, \ldots, \infty) \\ (c) & t(\xi) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \ldots, t_{n-r}(\xi), \ldots\ldots\ldots, t_1(\xi)) \end{array} \quad \text{with } t_i(\xi) = \frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}} \text{ if } \theta_i > 0$$

where $\theta_i = \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i)$ and $c_{i+1} = \max\ \text{E-ord}(P_{i+1})$ is the critical value in dimension i.

In the case $J_i = 1$, define $t_i(\xi) = \infty$ and complete the E-resolution function t with so many ∞ components as needed in order to have always the same number of components, that is, $(t_{i-1}(\xi), \ldots, t_1(\xi)) = (\infty, \ldots, \infty)$.

If $\theta_i = 0$ then $t_i(\xi) = \Gamma(\xi)$, where Γ is the resolution function corresponding to the *monomial case*, see [10]. And complete the E-resolution function $(t_{i-1}(\xi), \ldots, t_1(\xi)) = (\infty \ldots, \infty)$.

Remark 4.21. To compute the maximal value of the E-resolution function t, it is enough to look at the points of maximal E-order, at each dimension i, where $\text{E-top}(P_i) \subset \text{E-top}(I_i)$.
Note that in this case $c_{i+1} = \theta_{i+1}$.

Remark 4.22. Let $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ be a binomial basic object along E. By construction, the value of the function t at a point ξ of the E-singular locus $\text{E-Sing}(J, c)$ only depends on the point ξ.

Notice that the value of the function t at any point does not depend on the Gröbner basis of the ideal J fixed at the beginning of the E-resolution process. This is because the E-order of an ideal I_i is independent of the selected set of generators of I_i.

Remark 4.23. Let v_i be the number of invertible variables in dimension i at the point ξ. Note that v_i provides a lower bound $\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i$ for the dimension of the next center of blowing up.

Lemma 4.24. *Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a totally ordered set with the lexicographical order. The function*

$$\begin{array}{rl} t: & W \to (\mathcal{I}, \leq) \\ & \xi \ \to t(\xi) \end{array}$$

is upper semi-continuous.

Proof.

- Since the function Γ is upper semi-continuous (see [10]), its extension to the E-singular locus of the pair (J, c)

  $$\begin{array}{rlcl} \Gamma(J): & \text{E-Sing}(J,c) & \to & (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Z}^n, \leq) \\ & \xi & \to & \Gamma(J)(\xi) := (-\Gamma_1(\xi), \Gamma_2(\xi), \Gamma_3(\xi)) \end{array}$$

  is also an upper semi-continuous function. Note that if the ideal J is a monomial ideal, then $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) = \text{ord}_\xi(J)$ for all $\xi \in W$ and therefore $\text{E-Sing}(J,c) = \text{Sing}(J,c)$.

  By proposition 3.6 the E-order is an upper semi-continuous function, therefore each t_i

  $$\begin{array}{rl} t_i: & W \to (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) \\ & \xi \ \to t_i(\xi) \end{array}$$

  is an upper semi-continuous function for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

- By induction, each tuple $(t_n), (t_n, t_{n-1}), (t_n, t_{n-1}, t_{n-2}), \ldots, (t_n, \ldots, t_j)$ is an upper semi-continuous function, since every component t_i it is. Hence $t = (t_n, \ldots, t_1)$ is an upper semi-continuous function.

□

Corollary 4.25. *As a consequence,*

$$\text{E-}\underline{\textbf{Max}}(t) = \{\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J,c) |\ t(\xi) = \max\ t\}$$

is a closed set. In fact, it is the next center to be blown up.

Remark 4.26. Moreover, by construction $\text{E-}\underline{\textbf{Max}}(t) = Z = \cap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \{x_i = 0\}$ with $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

4.3 Hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact

Notation 4.27. We denote as *i-th chart* the chart where we divide by x_i. For example, if the center of the next blow up is the point $\xi = (0, \ldots, 0, 1, \ldots, 1)$ where $\xi_k = 0$ for $k = 1, \ldots, s$ and $\xi_l = 1$ for $l = s+1, \ldots, n$, this transformation is expressed:

$$\begin{array}{ccl} K[x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-s}]_y & \to & k[x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-s}, \frac{x_1}{x_i}, \ldots, \frac{x_{i-1}}{x_i}, \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}, \ldots, \frac{x_s}{x_i}]_y \\ x_i & \to & x_i \\ x_j & \to & \frac{x_j}{x_i} \text{ for } j \neq i, j = 1, \ldots, s \\ y_j & \to & y_j \text{ for } j \neq i, j = 1, \ldots, n-s \end{array}$$

For simplicity, we will denote each $\frac{x_j}{x_i}$ as x'_j.

Proposition 4.28. *Let $P \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point where* $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P) = \theta > 0$ *is maximal. Let $Z = \cap_{i \in \mathcal{I}}\{x_i = 0\} \subset$ E-top(P) be the next center to be blown up, with $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Let $W \overset{\pi}{\leftarrow} W'$ be the blow up along Z, where W' is the strict transform of W.*

The total transform of P in W' satisfies $P\mathcal{O}_{W'} = I(Y')^\theta \cdot P^\curlyvee$ where $P^\curlyvee$ is the weak transform of P, and Y' is the exceptional divisor. Then

$$\text{E-ord}_\xi(P) \geq \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P^\curlyvee)$$

for all $\xi' \in W'$ with $\pi(\xi') = \xi$.

Proof. By construction P is generated by binomials of the form $y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta$ with $|\alpha| > 0$ as in equation (2). Let $f(x, y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta \in P$ be an equation in P such that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = \theta = |\alpha|$. Let assume f has no common factors. After the blow up along Z:

- At some j-th chart where $\alpha_j > 0$, the E-order of $f^\curlyvee$ drops respect to the E-order of f

  $$f^*(x', y) = {x_j}'^{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \alpha_i} \cdot f^\curlyvee(x', y) = {x_j}'^{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \alpha_i} \cdot (y^\gamma {x'}^{\alpha^*} - b{x'}^\beta {x_j}'^{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(\beta_i - \alpha_i)})$$

  where $\alpha^* = \alpha - (0, \ldots, 0, \alpha_j, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $|\alpha^*| = |\alpha| - \alpha_j$, and $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \alpha_i = \theta$ since $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = \theta$ and $Z \subset$ E-top(P).

  The center Z satisfies $Z \subset$ E-top(P) then $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(\beta_i - \alpha_i) \geq 0$, so

  $$|\beta| + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(\beta_i - \alpha_i) \geq |\beta| \geq |\alpha| > |\alpha^*|$$

  and therefore $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(f^\curlyvee) = |\alpha^*| < |\alpha|$.

- At some $(k + j)$-th chart where $1 \leq j \leq l$, $\beta_{k+j} > 0$,

  $$f^\curlyvee(x', y) = y^\gamma {x'}^\alpha - b{x'}^{\beta^*} {x_{k+j}}'^{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(\beta_i - \alpha_i)}$$

  with $\beta^* = \beta - (0, \ldots, 0, \beta_{k+j}, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Then $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(f^\curlyvee) \leq |\alpha|$.

This provides $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P^\curlyvee) \leq \text{E-ord}_\xi(P)$. □

Remark 4.29. Note that $Z \subset$ E-top(P) does not imply $Z \subset$ *top*(P). In the previous proof, it is not allowed to use $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P) \leq \text{ord}_\xi(P)$ and that the property to be proved holds for the order function, because these facts can not assure $Z \subset$ *top*(P).

Corollary 4.30. *As a consequence of proposition 4.28,* $\max\ \text{E-ord}(P) \geq \max\ \text{E-ord}(P^\curlyvee)$.

Lemma 4.31. Existence of hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact
Let $P_l \subset \mathcal{O}_{W_l}$ be a binomial ideal (2.4) in dimension l, $n \geq l \geq 1$. Suppose $l = n$.
There exists a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P_n of type $\{x_i = 0\}$.

Proof. By construction P_n is generated by binomial equations $y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta$ with $|\alpha| > 0$ as in (2), or their p-th powers. Set $\theta_n = \max\ \text{E-ord}(P_n)$. Let $f(x, y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta \in P_n$ be a binomial equation such that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = \theta_n = |\alpha|$ at some point $\xi \in W$. Assume f has no common factors.

By corollary (3.17), $\text{E-Sing}(P_n, \theta_n) \subseteq \{x_i = 0\}$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $\alpha_i > 0$. Blow up along some combinatorial center $Z = \cap_{j\in\mathcal{I}}\{x_j = 0\} \subset \text{E-top}(P_n) \subset \{x_i = 0\}$, with $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. For some point $\xi' \in W'$ such that $\pi(\xi') = \xi$, if the E-order remains constant $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P_n^{\curlyvee}) = \theta_n$ then $\text{E-Sing}(P_n^{\curlyvee}, \theta_n) \subseteq \{x_i' = 0\}$.

Proceed as in proof of proposition (4.28). At some j-th chart with $\alpha_j > 0$ the E-order of $f^{\curlyvee}$ strictly decreases respect to the E-order of f. Then look at some $(k+j)$-th chart with $1 \leq j \leq l$, $\beta_{k+j} > 0$. At this chart $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(f^{\curlyvee}) \leq |\alpha|$.

Since $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P_n^{\curlyvee}) = |\alpha| = \theta_n$ then $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(f^{\curlyvee}) = |\alpha|$. Moreover $\alpha_i > 0$, then $f^{\curlyvee}$ satisfies the hypothesis of theorem (3.16). Therefore,

$$\text{E-Sing}(P_n^{\curlyvee}, |\alpha|) \subseteq S_{f^{\curlyvee},E}(\xi') \subseteq \{x_i' = 0\}. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.32. Stability under blowing-up
Let V be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for a binomial ideal P. Let $Z \subset \text{E-top}(P)$ be the next combinatorial center to be blown up. Let $V' = \{x_i' = 0\}$ be the strict transform of V by the blow up along Z.

If the E-order remains constant after the blow up, then V' is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for $P^{\curlyvee}$.

Proof. With the notation of the previous lemma, note that $f^{\curlyvee} \in P^{\curlyvee}$ is of the form $f^{\curlyvee}(x', y) = y^{\gamma} {x'}^{\alpha'} - b{x'}^{\beta'}$ where $\alpha_i' > 0$. It satisfies the conditions of proof of lemma (4.31). $\square$

Remark 4.33. In the proof of lemma (4.31) it is necessary to use $\text{E-ord}_{\xi}(P_i) \geq \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P_i^{\curlyvee})$ for a binomial ideal P_i in dimension i, whereas the E-resolution function remains constant at higher dimension $(t_n'(\xi'), \ldots, t_{i+1}'(\xi')) = (t_n(\xi), \ldots, t_{i+1}(\xi))$. This fact is consequence of lemma (4.45).

4.34. It is necessary to consider H as part of a BBOE in order to take into account the exceptional divisors coming from the previous blow ups and their transforms (which, in fact, belong to E).

When the higher coordinates of the E-resolution function remain constant under the blow up, the strict transforms of the hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact coming from the previous step are again hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact. In this situation, it is indispensable to consider these strict transforms at the same position as their ancestors in the previous step.

This means to determine the set of *permissible* hypersurfaces.

4.35. Let $H_i^{(k)} \neq \emptyset$ be the exceptional divisor in dimension i, at the k-th stage of the E-resolution process.

Let $\xi^{(k_0)} \in W^{(k_0)}, \xi^{(k-1)} \in W^{(k-1)}$ and $\xi^{(k)} \in W^{(k)}$ be points where the E-resolution function attains its maximal value and satisfy $\pi_k(\xi^{(k)}) = \xi^{(k-1)}, \ldots, \pi_{k_0+1}(\xi^{(k_0+1)}) = \xi^{(k_0)}$, $k_0 \leq k$.

If $\max\ t_i^{(k)} > 0$, let k_0 be the smaller superscript such that

$$\max\ t_i^{(k_0-1)} > \max\ t_i^{(k_0)} = \ldots = \max\ t_i^{(k)}$$

when the higher coordinates of the E-resolution function remain constant under the blow up,

$$\begin{aligned}(t_n^{(k)}(\xi^{(k)}), t_{n-1}^{(k)}(\xi^{(k)}), \ldots, t_i^{(k)}(\xi^{(k)})) &= (t_n^{(k-1)}(\xi^{(k-1)}), t_{n-1}^{(k-1)}(\xi^{(k-1)}), \ldots, t_i^{(k-1)}(\xi^{(k-1)})) \\ &= \ldots = (t_n^{(k_0)}(\xi^{(k_0)}), t_{n-1}^{(k_0)}(\xi^{(k_0)}), \ldots, t_i^{(k_0)}(\xi^{(k_0)})).\end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.36. Let $H_i^{(k)-}$ be the set of hypersurfaces of $H_i^{(k)}$ which are strict transforms of hypersurfaces in $H_i^{(k_0)}$, following the notation of paragraph 4.35. Then, set $H_i^{(k)}$ as the disjoint union $H_i^{(k)} = H_i^{(k)+} \sqcup H_i^{(k)-}$.

The hypersurfaces in $H_i^{(k)-}$ are called *permissible* hypersurfaces, in the sense that they are the only hypersurfaces of E-maximal contact that can be considered in practice to make induction on the dimension at this step of the E-resolution process.

Remark 4.37. If $H = \emptyset$ then any hypersurface of E-maximal contact is permissible.

4.4 Stability of binomial basic objects along E

In this section we prove the stability of the structure of a BBOE, following the same point of view as in [9] page 837.

After a blow up π, when the coordinates of the E-resolution function from dimension n up to dimension $i+1$ remain constant, we construct the corresponding BBOE in dimension i.

At some stage of the E-resolution process, the ideals $(J_n,\dots,J_{i+1})$ are defined in $W_n,\dots,W_{i+1}$ in a neighborhood of the point ξ. After a blow up $W_n \xleftarrow{\pi} W'_n$, it is possible to construct $(J'_n,\dots,J'_{i+1})$ in $W'_n,\dots,W'_{i+1}$ in a neighborhood of the point ξ', with $\pi(\xi')=\xi$.

Notation 4.38. For some $j+1$ with $n \geq j \geq i+1$, following the notation of [9], denote by

$$O'_{j+1}=\{\xi' \in W'_{j+1} |\ (t'_n(\xi'),\dots,t'_{j+2}(\xi'))=(t_n(\xi),\dots,t_{j+2}(\xi)),\theta'_{j+1}=\theta_{j+1}\}$$

the set of points in W'_{j+1} where the E-resolution function remains constant up to dimension $j+2$ and $\theta'_{j+1}=\theta_{j+1}$.

The set T'_{j+1} is the set of points in W'_{j+1} where the E-resolution function remains constant up to dimension $j+1$,

$$T'_{j+1}=\{\xi' \in W'_{j+1} \mid (t'_n(\xi'),\dots,t'_{j+1}(\xi'))=(t_n(\xi),\dots,t_{j+1}(\xi))\}.$$

Proposition 4.39. *At any stage $j+1$ of the E-resolution process $T'_{j+1}=O'_{j+1}$.*

Proof. Since $c_k=\text{E-ord}(P_k)=\text{E-ord}(I_k)=\theta_k$ for all $n \geq k \geq 1$ at the points of maximal E-order, the E-resolution function satisfies

$$(t_n(\xi),\dots,t_{j+1}(\xi))=\left(\frac{\theta_n}{c_{n+1}},\frac{\theta_{n-1}}{c_n},\dots,\frac{\theta_{j+2}}{c_{j+3}},\frac{\theta_{j+1}}{c_{j+2}}\right)=\left(\frac{\theta_n}{c},\frac{\theta_{n-1}}{\theta_n},\dots,\frac{\theta_{j+2}}{\theta_{j+3}},\frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_{j+2}}\right).$$

It is obvious that $T'_{j+1}\subset O'_{j+1}$. If $\xi' \in O'_{j+1}$ then

$$\left(\frac{\theta'_n}{c},\frac{\theta'_{n-1}}{\theta'_n},\dots,\frac{\theta'_{j+2}}{\theta'_{j+3}}\right)=\left(\frac{\theta_n}{c},\frac{\theta_{n-1}}{\theta_n},\dots,\frac{\theta_{j+2}}{\theta_{j+3}}\right)$$

what implies $\theta'_{j+2}=\theta_{j+2}$. On the other hand $\theta'_{j+1}=\theta_{j+1}$ so $t'_{j+1}(\xi')=t_{j+1}(\xi)$. Therefore $\xi' \in T'_{j+1}$. ☐

4.40. After the blowing up $W_n \xleftarrow{\pi} W'_n$, the new setup constructed in $W'_n,\dots,W'_{i+1}$ satisfy, for all $n \geq j \geq i+1$:

- $W'_j=W_j^{\curlyvee}$ for all point in O'_{j+1}, where $W_j^{\curlyvee}$ is the strict transform of W_j.
- $J'_j=J^{!}_j$ and $I'_j=I_j^{\curlyvee}$ in T'_{j+1}. To construct the ideals M'_j (remark 4.1) the divisors D'_j are defined as in [9]

$$D'_j=\begin{cases} D^*_j+(\theta_j-c_{j+1})\cdot Y' & \text{if } (t'_n(\xi'),\dots,t'_{j+1}(\xi'))=(t_n(\xi),\dots,t_{j+1}(\xi)) \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise}\end{cases} \tag{7}$$

  in the neighborhood of a point $\xi \in W_j$. Where D^*_j is the pullback of D_j by the blow up π, Y' is the exceptional divisor, the point $\xi' \in W'_j$ satisfies $\pi(\xi')=\xi$, $\theta_j=\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_j)$ and c_{j+1} is the corresponding critical value.

- $P'_j = P_j^\curlyvee$ in T'_j. The exceptional divisor H'_j is defined as in [9]

$$H'_j = \begin{cases} H_j^\curlyvee & \text{if } \xi' \in T'_j \\ (Y' + (H_1 \cup \ldots \cup H_n)^\curlyvee) - (H'_n + \cdots + H'_{j+1}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

  in the neighborhood of a point $\xi \in W_j$. Where $H_j^\curlyvee$ is the strict transform of H_j by the blow up π, Y' is the exceptional divisor, the point $\xi' \in W'_j$ satisfies $\pi(\xi') = \xi$, $\theta'_j = \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I'_j)$ and $\theta_j = \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_j)$.

- $E'_j = E' \cap W'_j$.

Assume each W_j is of E-maximal contact for P_{j+1} in a neighborhood of ξ, for $n-1 \geq j \geq i$. Analogously assume W'_j is of E-maximal contact for P'_{j+1} in a neighborhood of ξ', for $n-1 \geq j \geq i+1$.

The key point is find a regular hypersurface W'_i in a neighborhood of $\xi' \in W'_{i+1}$ such that W'_i is of E-maximal contact for P'_{i+1} and the previous commutativity relations (4.40) are also fulfilled for $j = i$.

4.41. Constructions in dimension i.

By hypothesis W_i is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P_{i+1}. And by construction $P'_{i+1} = P_{i+1}^\curlyvee$ in T'_{i+1} where $\theta'_{i+1} = \theta_{i+1}$. Then $W_i^\curlyvee$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P'_{i+1}.

So, we define $W'_i = W_i^\curlyvee$ in T'_{i+1}. Note that the E-order has not remained constant along the points of W'_{i+1} outside T'_{i+1}. At those points, by lemma (4.31) there exists a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P'_{i+1} in a neighborhood of ξ', for all $\xi' \in \text{E-top}(P'_{i+1})$.

Let J'_i be the junior ideal of P'_{i+1} in W'_i.

- Assume P_{i+1} and P'_{i+1} are not bold regular or 1. In T'_{i+1} it holds $\theta'_{i+1} = \theta_{i+1}$ then

$$c'_{i+1} = \text{E-ord}(P'_{i+1}) = \theta'_{i+1} = \theta_{i+1} = \text{E-ord}(P_{i+1}) = c_{i+1}$$

  at the points of maximal E-order. By proposition (4.13)

$$(\text{E-Coeff}_{W_i}(P_{i+1}))^! = \text{E-Coeff}_{W'_i}(P_{i+1}^\curlyvee) \tag{9}$$

  therefore, the controlled transform of J_i satisfies

$$(J_i)^! = (\text{E-Coeff}_{W_i}(P_{i+1}))^! = \text{E-Coeff}_{W'_i}(P'_{i+1}) = J'_i$$

  since $P'_{i+1} = P_{i+1}^\curlyvee$.

- If P'_{i+1} is bold regular or 1, the previous equality (9) gives $(\text{E-Coeff}_{W_i}(P_{i+1}))^! = 0$. Then, by proposition 4.16, P_{i+1} is bold regular or 1 and $J'_i = J_i^! = 1$.

- If $P_{i+1} = 1$ then $P'_{i+1} = P_{i+1}^\curlyvee = 1$ in T'_{i+1} and $J'_i = J_i^! = 1$.

- If $P_{i+1} \neq 1$ and it is bold regular, then $P_{i+1} =< y^\gamma(1-\mu y^\delta)x_1^{\alpha_1} >$ where $\mu \in K$, $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_1 = \max\ \text{E-ord}(P_{i+1}) > 0$. The hypersurface $\{x_1 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P_{i+1}. A blow up along a combinatorial center $Z \subset \{x_1 = 0\}$ provides $P'_{i+1} = P_{i+1}^\curlyvee =< y^\gamma(1-\mu y^\delta) >$. So $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P'_{i+1}) = 0$ for all $\xi' \in W'_i$ and then $\theta'_{i+1} = 0 < \theta_{i+1}$ therefore $\xi' \notin T'_{i+1}$.

Hence $J'_i = J^!_i$ in T'_{i+1}.

The ideal $M'_i = I_{W'_i}(D'_i \cap W'_i)$ has support in the divisor D'_i, defined as in equation (7). If $J_i = M_i \cdot I_i$ the controlled transform $J^!_i = I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{-c_{i+1}} \cdot J^*_i$ in W'_i. In addition if $M'_i = I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{\theta_i - c_{i+1}} \cdot M^*_i$ in T'_{i+1} with $\theta_i = \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i)$ and $I^{\curlyvee}_i = I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{-\theta_i} \cdot I^*_i$, then

$$\begin{aligned} J'_i &= I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{-c_{i+1}} \cdot J^*_i = I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{-c_{i+1}} \cdot (M_i \cdot I_i)^* \\ &= I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{-c_{i+1}} \cdot M^*_i \cdot I^*_i \\ &= I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{-c_{i+1}} \cdot I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{c_{i+1}-\theta_i} \cdot M'_i \cdot I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{\theta_i} \cdot I^{\curlyvee}_i = M'_i \cdot I^{\curlyvee}_i \end{aligned}$$

so $J'_i = M'_i \cdot I'_i$ where $I'_i = I^{\curlyvee}_i$ in T'_{i+1}. Note that $J'_i = I'_i$ outside T'_{i+1}, since in this case $D'_i = \emptyset$.

Let $\xi' \in T'_{i+1}$ be a point such that $\pi(\xi') = \xi$. We have $I'_i = I^{\curlyvee}_i$ in T'_{i+1}. If $\theta'_i = \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I'_i) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i) = \theta_i$ in a neighborhood of ξ' then $\xi' \in T'_i$.

Construct now the companion ideal P'_i in T'_i. We have $M'_i = M^*_i \cdot I_{W'_i}(Y' \cap W'_i)^{\theta_i - c_{i+1}}$, $c'_{i+1} = c_{i+1}$ and $\theta'_i = \theta_i$, then

$$\begin{aligned} P^{\curlyvee}_i &= (I_i + M_i^{\frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}-\theta_i}})^{\curlyvee} = I^{\curlyvee}_i + (M_i^{\frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}-\theta_i}})' = I^{\curlyvee}_i + (M'_i)^{\frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}-\theta_i}} = \\ &= I'_i + (M'_i)^{\frac{\theta'_i}{c'_{i+1}-\theta'_i}} = P'_i \end{aligned}$$

because of $I^{\curlyvee}_i = I'_i$. The case $P_i = I_i$ is obvious. Therefore $P'_i = P^{\curlyvee}_i$ in T'_i.

Finally, the exceptional divisor H'_i is defined as in equation (8), and $E'_i = E \cap W'_i$.

Remark 4.42. As a consequence, all the results of section (4.3) hold replacing $P^{\curlyvee}$ by P'.

4.5 Commutativity

The computation of the coefficient ideal along E commutes with the blowing up.

Corollary 4.43. *Let P be an ideal in W. Let $\xi \in W$ be a point where $c = \text{E-ord}_\xi(P)$. Let π be the blow up along $Z \subset \text{E-top}(P)$, where $\pi(\xi') = \xi$ and $c' = \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(P')$. If $c' = c$ then the coefficient ideal of P along E with respect to V satisfies*

$$\text{E-Coeff}_{V'}(P') = (\text{E-Coeff}_V(P))'$$

where $P' = P^{\curlyvee}$ and V' is the strict transform of V.

Proof. By proposition 4.13

$$\text{E-Coeff}_{V'}(P') = \text{E-Coeff}_{V^{\curlyvee}}(P^{\curlyvee}) = (\text{E-Coeff}_V(P))^! = (\text{E-Coeff}_V(P))'.$$

□

The inductive step from dimension i to dimension $i-1$ commutes with the blowing up.

Corollary 4.44. *Let $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ be a binomial basic object along E. By induction on the dimension, construct the binomial basic objects*

$$(W, (J, c), H, E) = (W_n, (J_n, c_{n+1}), H_n, E_n), \ldots, (W_i, (J_i, c_{i+1}), H_i, E_i).$$

Let

$$(W'_n, (J'_n, c_{n+1}), H'_n, E'_n), \ldots, (W'_i, (J'_i, c'_{i+1}), H'_i, E'_i)$$

be their transforms by the blow up π along a permissible center Z. Let $\xi \in Z$ be a point. In the neighborhood of a point $\xi' \in W_i'$ such that $\pi(\xi') = \xi$, if the E-resolution function remains constant $(t_n'(\xi'), t_{n-1}'(\xi'), \dots, t_i'(\xi')) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \dots, t_i(\xi))$ then

$$J_{i-1}' = (J_{i-1})'.$$

Proof. Let $V = \{x_j = 0\}$ be a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for P_i in a neighborhood of ξ. If $(t_n'(\xi'), t_{n-1}'(\xi'), \dots, t_i'(\xi')) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \dots, t_i(\xi))$ then $c_i' = c_i$ and $\text{E-Sing}(P_i', c_i') \subseteq V'$. By definition $J_{i-1} = \text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i)$. By corollary 4.43 $\text{E-Coeff}_{V'}(P_i') = (\text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i))'$, then

$$J_{i-1}' = \text{E-Coeff}_{V'}(P_i') = (\text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i))' = (J_{i-1})'.$$

□

4.6 Decrease of the E-resolution function

In this section we prove that the E-resolution function drops lexicographically after blowing up.

Lemma 4.45. *Let $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ be a binomial basic object along E, where $J \neq 1$. Let $W \xleftarrow{\pi} W'$ be the blow up along $Z = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}(t)$. Then*

$$t(\xi) > t'(\xi')$$

for all $\xi \in Z$, $\xi' \in Y' = \pi^{-1}(Z)$, $\pi(\xi') = \xi$, where t is the E-resolution function corresponding to $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ and t' corresponds to $(W', (J', c), H', E')$, its transform by the blow up π.

Proof.

Step 1 : The E-resolution function satisfies $t(\xi) \geq t'(\xi')$.

Let $Z = \cap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \{x_i = 0\}$ be the next center of blowing up, with $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$.

By definition of the E-resolution function $t_n(\xi) = \frac{\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n)}{c}$ and $t_n'(\xi') = \frac{\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I_n')}{c}$.

Proposition 4.28 and remark 4.42 imply $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n) \geq \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I_n')$ therefore $t_n(\xi) \geq t_n'(\xi')$.

- If $t_n(\xi) > t_n'(\xi')$ then $t(\xi) \geq t'(\xi')$, in fact $t(\xi) > t'(\xi')$.
- If $t_n(\xi) = t_n'(\xi')$ then $I_{n-1}' = I_{n-1}^{\curlyvee}$. So $t_{n-1}(\xi) \geq t_{n-1}'(\xi')$ by proposition 4.28.

Hence $(t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi)) \geq (t_n'(\xi'), t_{n-1}'(\xi'))$. By induction on the dimension, if

$$(t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \dots, t_{j+1}(\xi)) = (t_n'(\xi'), t_{n-1}'(\xi'), \dots, t_{j+1}'(\xi'))$$

then $t_j(\xi) \geq t_j'(\xi')$ so $t(\xi) \geq t'(\xi')$.

- Non monomial case: By construction the E-resolution function satisfies

  $$(t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \dots, t_i(\xi)) = \left(\frac{\theta_n}{c_{n+1}}, \frac{\theta_{n-1}}{c_n}, \frac{\theta_{n-2}}{c_{n-1}}, \dots, \frac{\theta_i}{c_{i+1}}\right)$$

  where $c_j = \theta_j$, for $n \geq j \geq i+1$.

  If $(t_n'(\xi'), t_{n-1}'(\xi'), \dots, t_i'(\xi')) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \dots, t_i(\xi))$ then $c_i = \theta_i = \theta_i' = c_i'$ whereas $\theta_i \neq 0$. So it is enough to show $\theta_{i-1} \geq \theta_{i-1}'$ to obtain $t_{i-1}(\xi) \geq t_{i-1}'(\xi')$.
- Monomial case: If $(t_n'(\xi'), t_{n-1}'(\xi'), \dots, t_i'(\xi')) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \dots, t_i(\xi))$ and $\theta_{i-1} = 0$ then $t_{i-1}(\xi) = \Gamma(\xi)$. Therefore $t_{i-1}(\xi) \geq t_{i-1}'(\xi')$ by well known properties of Γ function.

Step 2 : Induction on the dimension of the ambient space W.

Assume $n = 1$. Let $J = I =< x_1^{\theta}(1 - x_1^{\alpha-\theta}) >$ be a binomial ideal in one variable.

- If $\xi_1 = 0$ then in a neighborhood of ξ, $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I) = \theta$. The controlled transform of J by π is $J' =< (x_1^{\theta-c}) \cdot (1 - x_1^{\alpha-\theta}) >$ therefore $\text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I') = 0 < \theta$.
- If $\xi_1 \neq 0$ then in a neighborhood of ξ, $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I) = 0$ so we use Γ function.

  This case can not come from an ideal in higher dimension. If $J = \text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(P_2)$ then $P_2 =< x_2^{\theta_2} x_1^{\theta}(1 - x_1^{\alpha-\theta}), f_2, \ldots, f_r >$ where the variable x_2 appears in f_i, for $2 \leq i \leq r$, with an exponent bigger than or equal to $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P_2)$. Since $\xi_1 \neq 0$ we have $\text{E-ord}_\xi(P_2) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(x_2^{\theta_2}) = \theta_2$, but in this case $\text{E-Coeff}_{\{x_2=0\}}(P_2) = 0$, contradiction.

If $J =< x^{\theta_1} >$ it is enough to note $J' =< (x^{\theta_1 - c}) >= M'$ with $I' = 1$. So $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I) = \theta_1 > \text{E-ord}_{\xi'}(I') = 0$.

Study the case $n > 1$. If $(t'_n(\xi'), t'_{n-1}(\xi'), \ldots, t'_{j+1}(\xi')) = (t_n(\xi), t_{n-1}(\xi), \ldots, t_{j+1}(\xi))$ then $t_j(\xi) \geq t'_j(\xi')$ by step 1. Therefore

- either $\theta_j > \theta'_j$
- or $\theta_j = \theta'_j$. Observe that this is not possible when $j = 1$, hence $t(\xi) > t'(\xi')$.

□

5 Algorithm of E-resolution of BBOE

In this section we construct an algorithm of E-resolution of binomial basic objects along E.

5.1 E-resolution of BBOE: Inductive step

A E-resolution of binomial basic objects along E in dimension $n - 1$ provides a E-resolution of binomial basic objects along E in dimension n.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$ be a binomial basic object along $E^{(0)}$ of dimension n. Let*

$$(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}, (J^{(r)}, c), H^{(r)}, E^{(r)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_{r+1}} \ldots$$

be an equivariant sequence of transformations of binomial basic objects along combinatorial centers $Z^{(k)} \subset \text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)}, c)$ for $k \geq 0$.

Let $\mathcal{I}_n$ be a totally ordered set. Let $t^{(k)} : \text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)}, c) \to \mathcal{I}_n$ be an equivariant function defined as in 4.20 such that $Z^{(k)} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)}$, for $k \geq 0$.

Let $r_0 < r$ be the last superscript where t_n has dropped. This means there exists a sequence of transformations

$$\ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_{r_0}} (W_n^{(r_0)}, (J_n^{(r_0)}, c), H_n^{(r_0)}, E_n^{(r_0)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_{r_0+1}} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W_n^{(r)}, (J_n^{(r)}, c), H_n^{(r)}, E_n^{(r)}) \tag{10}$$

such that $\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t_n^{(k)} = \text{E-Sing}(J_{n-1}^{(k)}, c_n^{(k)})$ for $r_0 \leq k \leq r$, satisfying

$$max\ t_n^{(r_0-1)} > max\ t_n^{(r_0)} = max\ t_n^{(r_0+1)} = \ldots = max\ t_n^{(r)}.$$

They are equivalent:

1. *$max\ t_n^{(r)} > max\ t_n^{(r+1)}$.*

2. E-Sing$((J_{n-1}^{(r)})', c_n^{(r_0)}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. By induction on the dimension the sequence (10) of transformations of BBOE in dimension n induces a sequence of transformations of BBOE in dimension $n-1$

$$(W_{n-1}^{(r_0)}, (J_{n-1}^{(r_0)}, c_n^{(r_0)}), H_{n-1}^{(r_0)}, E_{n-1}^{(r_0)}) \overset{\pi_{r_0+1}}{\longleftarrow} \ldots \overset{\pi_r}{\longleftarrow} (W_{n-1}^{(r)}, (J_{n-1}^{(r)}, c_n^{(r)}), H_{n-1}^{(r)}, E_{n-1}^{(r)})$$

Since $max\ t_n^{(r_0)} = max\ t_n^{(r_0+1)} = \ldots = max\ t_n^{(r)}$ we have $c_n^{(r_0)} = c_n^{(r_0+1)} = \ldots = c_n^{(r)}$. By corollary 4.44 we obtain $J_{n-1}^{(r_0+1)} = (J_{n-1}^{(r_0)})', \ldots, J_{n-1}^{(r)} = (J_{n-1}^{(r-1)})'$.

On the other hand, lemma 4.45 implies

$$max\ (t_{n-1}^{(r_0)}, \ldots, t_1^{(r_0)}) > max\ (t_{n-1}^{(r_0+1)}, \ldots, t_1^{(r_0+1)}) > \ldots > max\ (t_{n-1}^{(r)}, \ldots, t_1^{(r)}).$$

- Assume $max\ t_n^{(r)} > max\ t_n^{(r+1)}$ then $c_n^{(r_0)} = c_n^{(r)} > c_n^{(r+1)}$, where

  $$c_n^{(r+1)} = max\ \text{E-ord}(P_n^{(r+1)}) = max\ \text{E-ord}(I_n^{(r+1)}).$$

  Hence $J_{n-1}^{(r+1)} = \text{E-Coeff}_{W_{n-1}^{(r+1)}}(P_n^{(r+1)}) \neq (J_{n-1}^{(r)})'$. Therefore

  $$\begin{aligned}\text{E-Sing}((J_{n-1}^{(r)})', c_n^{(r_0)}) &= \{\xi \in \text{E-Sing}((J_{n-1}^{(r+1)}), c_n^{(r+1)}) \mid \text{E-ord}_\xi((J_{n-1}^{(r)})') \geq c_n^{(r_0)}\} \\ &= \{\xi \in \text{E-Sing}((J_{n-1}^{(r+1)}), c_n^{(r+1)}) \mid c_n^{(r+1)} \geq c_n^{(r_0)}\} = \emptyset.\end{aligned}$$

- Conversely, suppose $max\ t_n^{(r)} = max\ t_n^{(r+1)}$ then $c_n^{(r_0)} = c_n^{(r)} = c_n^{(r+1)}$ and corollary 4.44 implies $J_{n-1}^{(r+1)} = (J_{n-1}^{(r)})'$.

  By construction, if $P_n^{(r+1)} = I_n^{(r+1)} + (M_n^{(r+1)})^{\frac{c_n^{(r+1)}}{c_{n+1}^{(r+1)} - c_n^{(r+1)}}}$ with $c_{n+1}^{(r+1)} = c$, then

  $$\text{E-Sing}(P_n^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-Sing}(I_n^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)}) \cap \text{E-Sing}(M_n^{(r+1)}, c_{n+1}^{(r+1)} - c_n^{(r+1)}) \tag{11}$$

  where $c_n^{(r+1)} = max\ \text{E-ord}(P_n^{(r+1)}) = max\ \text{E-ord}(I_n^{(r+1)})$.

  In fact

  $$\text{E-Sing}(P_n^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-Sing}(I_n^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)}) \cap \text{E-Sing}(J_n^{(r+1)}, c_{n+1}^{(r+1)}). \tag{12}$$

  One direction is obvious by equality (11). For the other direction, let $\xi \in W^{(r+1)}$ be a point such that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J_n^{(r+1)}) \geq c_{n+1}^{(r+1)}$ and $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(r+1)}) = c_n^{(r+1)}$ then

  $$\text{E-ord}_\xi(M_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(J_n^{(r+1)}) - \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(r+1)}) \geq c_{n+1}^{(r+1)} - c_n^{(r+1)}.$$

  So $\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(P_n^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)})$ because of (11).

  As a consequence of (12) it holds

  $$\begin{aligned}\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t_n^{(r+1)} &= \{\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J_n^{(r+1)}, c_{n+1}^{(r+1)}) \mid t_n^{(r+1)}(\xi) = max\ t_n^{(r+1)}\} \\ &= \{\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J_n^{(r+1)}, c_{n+1}^{(r+1)}) \mid \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(r+1)}) = max\ \text{E-ord}(I_n^{(r+1)})\} \\ &= \text{E-Sing}(P_n^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)}).\end{aligned}$$

By proposition 4.12

$$\text{E-top}(P_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-top}(\text{E-Coeff}_{W_{n-1}^{(r+1)}}(P_n^{(r+1)}), c_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-top}(J_{n-1}^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)})$$

then

$$\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t_n^{(r+1)} = \text{E-top}(P_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-Sing}(J_{n-1}^{(r+1)}, c_n^{(r+1)}) = \text{E-Sing}((J_{n-1}^{(r)})', c_n^{(r+1)})$$

contradiction with $\text{E-Sing}((J_{n-1}^{(r)})', c_n^{(r_0)}) = \emptyset$.

□

5.2 E-resolution of BBOE: Algorithm

Definition 5.2. Let $(W,(P,c),H,E)$ be a binomial basic object along E. Denote

$$\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}(P) = \{\xi \in W \mid \text{ E-ord}_\xi(P) = max \ \text{ E-ord}(P)\}$$

the set of points where the ideal P attains its maximal E-order.

Remark 5.3. Note that $\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}(P) = S_{P,E}(\xi)$ for $\xi \in W$ a point of maximal E-order.

The special treatment of hyperbolic equations forces us to specify how to make induction on the dimension on the ambient space to construct the E-resolution function t.

Algorithm 5.4. Induction on the dimension.

Let $(W,(J,c),H,E)$ be a binomial basic object along E, $W = W_n$, $dim(W_n) = n$. If $\text{E-Sing}(J,c) \neq \emptyset$, assume $(t_n,\ldots,t_{i+1})$ and ideals $J_n,\ldots,J_{i+1},J_i$ are already given and construct t_i and J_{i-1}.

From $i = n$ to $i = 1$:

1. Factorize $J_i = M_i \cdot I_i$ where M_i has support in D_i.
2. Compute max $\text{E-ord}(I_i)$. Let $\xi \in \text{E-top}(I_i)$ be a point
    - If $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i) > 0$, $t_i(\xi) = \frac{\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i)}{\text{E-ord}_\xi(P_{i+1})}$. Compute the companion ideal P_i and go to step 3.
    - If $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_i) = 0$ for all $\xi \in W_i$ then apply Γ function to M_i, $(t_i(\xi), t_{i-1}(\xi),\ldots,t_1(\xi)) = (\Gamma(\xi),\infty,\ldots,\infty)$. Stop.
3. Fix $c_i = max$ $\text{E-ord}(P_i)$. Let $f \in P_i$ be a binomial such that $\text{E-ord}_\xi(f) = c_i$, $\xi \in W_i$. Corollary 3.17 provides a hypersurface V of E-maximal contact for P_i in a neighborhood of ξ. In fact, $V = \{x_j = 0\}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$.
4. Compute $\text{E-Coeff}(P_i)$ respect to $V \in H_i^-$, to construct J_{i-1} in W_{i-1} where $dim(W_{i-1}) = i-1$.
    - If $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i) = 0$ then P_i is bold regular, $J_{i-1} = 1$, $(t_{i-1}(\xi),\ldots,t_1(\xi)) = (\infty,\ldots,\infty)$. Stop.
    - If $\text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i) \neq 0$ then $J_{i-1} = \text{E-Coeff}_V(P_i)$ and go to step 1.

Remark 5.5. If $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I) = 0$ for all $\xi \in W$ but there exists at least a point $a \in W$ with $ord_a(I) \neq 0$ then there are hyperbolic equations in I.

- Note that in dimension $< n$, this kind of ideals I are considered $I = 1$. In step (2) of the algorithm, Γ function is applied since $\text{E-ord}_\xi(J) = \text{E-ord}_\xi(M)$. With respect to the E-order, J behaves as a monomial ideal.

- In dimension n, apply Γ function to J_n. Stop when $\text{E-Sing}(J_n, c) = \emptyset$.

Theorem 5.6. ***E*-resolution of binomial basic objects along *E*.**

An algorithm of E-resolution of binomial basic objects of dimension n along a normal crossing divisor E consist of:

A) A totally ordered set $(\mathcal{I}_n, \leq)$.

B) For each BBOE $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$ *where* $dim(W^{(0)}) = n$, $J^{(0)} = M^{(0)} \cdot I^{(0)}$ *and the ideal* $I^{(0)}$ *does not contain hyperbolic equations:*

1. *Define an equivariant function* $t^{(0)} : \text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c) \to \mathcal{I}_n$ *such that*

$$\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(0)} \subset \text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c)$$

is a permissible center for $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$.

2. *By induction, assume there exists an equivariant sequence of transformations of BBOE*

$$\begin{aligned}&(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \dots \\ &\quad \dots \xleftarrow{\pi_{r-1}} (W^{(r-1)}, (J^{(r-1)}, c), H^{(r-1)}, E^{(r-1)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}, (J^{(r)}, c), H^{(r)}, E^{(r)})\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

along centers $Z^{(k)} \subset \text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)}, c)$ *for* $0 \leq k \leq r-1$*; and equivariant functions*

$$t^{(k)} : \text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)}, c) \to \mathcal{I}_n$$

for $0 \leq k \leq r-1$, *such that* $Z^{(k)} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)}$.
If $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(r)}, c) \neq \emptyset$ *this sequence of transformations can be extended. This means at the r-th stage of the E-resolution process an equivariant function can be defined*

$$t^{(r)} : \text{E-Sing}(J^{(r)}, c) \to \mathcal{I}_n$$

such that $Z^{(r)} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(r)}$ *is a permissible center for* $(W^{(r)}, (J^{(r)}, c), H^{(r)}, E^{(r)})$.

C) For some r, the previous sequence of transformations (13) is a E-resolution of the original BBOE $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$, *that is,* $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(r)}, c) = \emptyset$.

Remark 5.7. The proof follows the same structure as the proof of the existence of an algorithm of resolution of basic objects (over fields of characteristic zero) given in [10], page 206.

Proof. By induction on n.

- If $n = 1$, fix $\mathcal{I}_1 = \mathbb{Q} \sqcup (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) \sqcup \{\infty\}$. Given the BBOE $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$ with $dim(W^{(0)}) = 1$ and $E^{(0)} = \{V(x_1)\}$ define

$$\begin{array}{rccc} t^{(0)}: & \text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c) & \to & \mathcal{I}_1 \\ & \xi & \to & \frac{\text{E-ord}_\xi(I^{(0)})}{c} \end{array}$$

as in 4.20. The ideal $J^{(0)}$ is a binomial ideal in one variable, then it is generated by binomial equations of the type $x_1^\alpha - bx_1^\beta = x_1^\alpha \cdot (1 - bx_1^{\beta-\alpha})$ where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\alpha \leq \beta$, and eventually, by monomials x_1^η, $\eta \in \mathbb{N}$.

By corollary 3.17, $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c) \subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$, since $I^{(0)}$ does not contain hyperbolic equations. But $\{x_1 = 0\}$ is a hypersurface in a space of dimension 1, so it is a closed point. Then

- either E-Sing$(J^{(0)}, c) = \emptyset$, the E-resolution process stops,
- or E-Sing$(J^{(0)}, c) = \{x_1 = 0\} = $ E-$\underline{\textbf{Max}}\, t^{(0)}$ is the next center to be blown up.

In this case, construct the following transformation of BBOE

$$(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_1} (W^{(1)}, (J^{(1)}, c), H^{(1)}, E^{(1)})$$

where $J^{(1)} = x_1^{\theta - c} \cdot I^{(1)}$, $\theta = \text{E-ord}_\xi(I^{(0)}) > 0$, for $\xi \in \{x_1 = 0\}$.

By lemma 4.45, $t^{(0)}(\xi) > t^{(1)}(\xi^{(1)})$ for $\xi \in$ E-$\underline{\textbf{Max}}\, t^{(0)}$, $\pi_1(\xi^{(1)}) = \xi$. Hence $max\ t^{(0)} > max\ t^{(1)}$.

If fact, since $J^{(0)}$ is a binomial ideal in one variable, $\text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(1)}}(I^{(1)}) = 0$ and in a neighborhood of $\xi^{(1)}$, it holds $(I^{(1)})_{\xi^{(1)}} = 1$.

By induction, assume it has been defined a sequence of transformations at permissible centers, which is a sequence of blow ups along a point,

$$(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}, (J^{(r)}, c), H^{(r)}, E^{(r)}). \tag{14}$$

Each center is E-$\underline{\textbf{Max}}(t^{(i)})$, $0 \leq i \leq r-1$, and the E-resolution function $t^{(i)}$ defined after each blow up π_i is

$$t^{(i)}(\xi^{(i)}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(i)}}(I^{(i)})}{c} & \text{if } \text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(i)}}(I^{(i)}) > 0 \\ \Gamma^{(i)}(\xi^{(i)}) & \text{if } \text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(i)}}(I^{(i)}) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq r-1$. If E-Sing$(J^{(r)}, c) \neq \emptyset$ define $t^{(r)}$ as above (15).

In this case $\text{E-ord}_{\xi^{(i)}}(I^{(i)}) = 0$ for all $\xi^{(i)} \in W^{(i)}$, $i \geq 1$. Hence apply Γ function to the ideals $I^{(i)}$. Lemma 4.45 implies

$$max\ t^{(0)} > max\ t^{(1)} > \ldots > max\ t^{(r)}.$$

Because of the upper semi-continuity of each $t^{(i)}$, there exists an index N such that the sequence (14) is a E-resolution of $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$.

Considering that the E-order is an equivariant function (3.12), each $t^{(i)}$ is an equivariant function.

- Fix $n > 1$. By induction hypothesis there exists a totally ordered set $(\mathcal{I}_{n-1}, \leq)$. In dimension n, consider

$$(\mathcal{I}_n, \leq) = ((\mathbb{Q} \sqcup (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) \sqcup \{\infty\}) \times \mathcal{I}_{n-1}, \leq)$$

with lexicographical order. Let $B^{(0)} = (W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$ be a BBOE of dimension n where $J^{(0)} = J_n^{(0)}$ and $E^{(0)} = \{V(x_1), \ldots, V(x_n)\}$. Define the following function

$$\begin{array}{rccc} g^{(0)}: & \text{E-Sing}(J_n^{(0)}, c) & \to & (\mathbb{Q} \sqcup (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) \sqcup \{\infty\}) \\ & \xi & \to & g^{(0)}(\xi) = t_n^{(0)}(\xi) \end{array}$$

where $t_n^{(0)}$ is defined as in 4.20, that is,

$$t_n^{(0)}(\xi) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } J_n^{(0)} = 1 \\ \frac{\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(0)})}{c} & \text{if } \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(0)}) > 0 \\ \Gamma(\xi) & \text{if } \text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(0)}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

In the case $\text{E-ord}_\xi(I_n^{(0)}) > 0$, by induction on the dimension, from the BBOE $B^{(0)}$ we can construct a BBOE in dimension $n-1$, $(W_{n-1}^{(0)}, (J_{n-1}^{(0)}, c_n^{(0)}), H_{n-1}^{(0)}, E_{n-1}^{(0)})$, where

- $W^{(0)}_{n-1}$ is a hypersurface of E-maximal contact for $P^{(0)}_n$. This hypersurface is given by lemma 4.31. The ideal $P^{(0)}_n$ is the companion ideal of $J^{(0)} = J^{(0)}_n$.
- $J^{(0)}_{n-1}$ is the junior ideal of $P^{(0)}_n$ in $W^{(0)}_{n-1}$.
- $c^{(0)}_n = max$ E-ord$(P^{(0)}_n)$.
- $H^{(0)}_{n-1} = H^{(0)} \cap W^{(0)}_{n-1}$.
- $E^{(0)}_{n-1} = E^{(0)} \cap W^{(0)}_{n-1}$.

Define

$$\begin{array}{rccl} h^{(0)}: & \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, g^{(0)} & \to & \mathcal{I}_{n-1} \\ & \xi & \to & h^{(0)}(\xi) = (t^{(0)}_{n-1}(\xi), \ldots, t^{(0)}_1(\xi)) \end{array}$$

where each function $t^{(0)}_i$, for $i = n-1, \ldots, 1$, is defined by induction hypothesis for the BBOE of dimension i, $(W^{(0)}_i, (J^{(0)}_i, c^{(0)}_{i+1}), H^{(0)}_i, E^{(0)}_i)$ according to 4.20.

Extend $h^{(0)}$ to all the points of E-Sing$(J^{(0)}, c)$:

> For each point $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) \in W = Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ define the open subset $U_\xi = Spec(K[x,y]_{y,\{x_j/\ \xi_j \neq 0\}}) \subset W$.
>
> Let $a \in$ E-Sing$(J^{(0)}, c)$ be a point such that E-ord$_a(I^{(0)}_n) > 0$ and $a \notin$ E-$\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, g^{(0)}$. Fix $a \in U_a$. Assume $x_j(a) = 0$ for all j, then $a \in$ E-$\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, g^{(0)}\Big|_{U_a}$.

Thus

$$\begin{array}{rccl} t^{(0)}: & \text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c) & \to & \mathcal{I}_n \\ & \xi & \to & t^{(0)}(\xi) = (g^{(0)}(\xi), h^{(0)}(\xi)) \end{array}$$

By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(0)} &= \{\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c) |\ g^{(0)}(\xi) = max\ g^{(0)},\ h^{(0)}(\xi) = max\ h^{(0)}\} \\ &= \{\xi \in \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, g^{(0)} |\ h^{(0)}(\xi) = max\ h^{(0)}\} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, h^{(0)} \end{aligned}$$

and it is a permissible center, since by induction hypothesis the result holds for BBOE of dimension $n-1$.

Now assume that by induction on the number of transformations we have defined a sequence of transformations at permissible centers

$$(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}, (J^{(r)}, c), H^{(r)}, E^{(r)}) \tag{16}$$

and a sequence of functions $t^{(1)} = (g^{(1)}, h^{(1)}), \ldots, t^{(r-1)} = (g^{(r-1)}, h^{(r-1)})$ satisfying the conditions of $B.2$.

To conclude, it is enough to show that if E-Sing$(J^{(r)}, c) \neq \emptyset$ then the sequence (16) extends to a E-resolution of $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$.

Define the function

$$\begin{array}{rccl} g^{(r)}: & \text{E-Sing}(J^{(r)}, c) & \to & (\mathbb{Q} \sqcup (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) \sqcup \{\infty\}) \\ & \xi & \to & g^{(r)}(\xi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \Gamma(\xi) & \text{if E-ord}_\xi(I^{(r)}) = 0 \\ t^{(r)}_n(\xi) & \text{if E-ord}_\xi(I^{(r)}) > 0 \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

and the function

$$\begin{array}{rccl} h^{(r)}: & \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, g^{(r)} & \to & \mathcal{I}_{n-1} \\ & \xi & \to & h^{(r)}(\xi) = (t^{(r)}_{n-1}(\xi), \ldots, t^{(r)}_1(\xi)) \end{array}$$

where each $t^{(r)}_i$ is defined (according to 4.20) by induction hypothesis for the BBOE of dimension i, $(W^{(r)}_i, (J^{(r)}_i, c^{(r)}_{i+1}), H^{(r)}_i, E^{(r)}_i)$, with $i = n-1, \ldots, 1$.

As above, extend the function $h^{(r)}$ to all points of E-Sing$(J^{(r)}, c)$ and set $t^{(r)} = (g^{(r)}, h^{(r)})$.

Analogously,

$$\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(r)} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, g^{(r)} \cap \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, h^{(r)} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, h^{(r)}$$

and by induction on the dimension E-$\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, h^{(r)}$ is a permissible center.

Consider the sequence of transformations in dimension n,

$$\ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_{r_0}} (W^{(r_0)}_n, (J^{(r_0)}_n, c), H^{(r_0)}_n, E^{(r_0)}_n) \xleftarrow{\pi_{r_0+1}} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}_n, (J^{(r)}_n, c), H^{(r)}_n, E^{(r)}_n) \tag{17}$$

satisfying

$$max\ t^{(r_0-1)}_n > max\ t^{(r_0)}_n = max\ t^{(r_0+1)}_n = \ldots = max\ t^{(r)}_n.$$

And the sequence of transformations in dimension $n-1$ induced by (17),

$$(W^{(r_0)}_{n-1}, (J^{(r_0)}_{n-1}, c^{(r_0)}_n), H^{(r_0)}_{n-1}, E^{(r_0)}_{n-1}) \xleftarrow{\pi_{r_0+1}} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}_{n-1}, (J^{(r)}_{n-1}, c^{(r)}_n), H^{(r)}_{n-1}, E^{(r)}_{n-1}). \tag{18}$$

Hence $c^{(r_0)}_n = c^{(r_0+1)}_n = \ldots = c^{(r)}_n$ where $c^{(i)}_n = max$ E-ord$(P^{(i)}_n) = max$ E-ord$(I^{(i)}_n)$ with $i = r_0, \ldots, r$. Then the sequence (18) in dimension $n-1$ is of the form

$$(W^{(r_0)}_{n-1}, (J^{(r_0)}_{n-1}, c^{(r_0)}_n), H^{(r_0)}_{n-1}, E^{(r_0)}_{n-1}) \xleftarrow{\pi_{r_0+1}} \ldots \xleftarrow{\pi_r} (W^{(r)}_{n-1}, (J^{(r)}_{n-1}, c^{(r_0)}_n), H^{(r)}_{n-1}, E^{(r)}_{n-1}).$$

By induction hypothesis we can extend the sequence (18) in dimension $n-1$ to a E-resolution of the corresponding BBOE in dimension $n-1$. Suppose this happens after r transformations, that is E-Sing$(J^{(r)}_{n-1}, c^{(r)}_n) = \emptyset$.

By proposition 5.1, after the next transformation, the first component of the E-resolution function drops $max\ g^{(r)} > max\ g^{(r+1)}$. Note that $max\ g^{(i)}$ can not decrease indefinitely many times because it takes values in $\frac{1}{c}\mathbb{N}$. Then there exists an index N such that the previous sequence (17) in dimension n is a E-resolution, that is, E-Sing$(J^{(N)}_n, c) = \emptyset$.

Since the E-order is an equivariant function (3.11), each $t^{(i)}$ is an equivariant function. Hence the E-resolution achieved in this way is invariant by the torus action. $\square$

Remark 5.8. Note that this algorithm 5.6 of E-resolution of a BBOE $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ is independent of the choice of coordinates and of the choice of the generator system of the ideal J.

Proposition 5.9. Properties of the algorithm given by Theorem 5.6.

Fix a BBOE $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ *and a E-resolution of this BBOE given by theorem 5.6. This means* E-Sing$(J^{(r)}, c) = \emptyset$ *for some* $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r > 0$.

1. *If* $\xi \in \text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)}, c)$ *for* $0 \leq k \leq r-1$, *and* $\xi \notin Z^{(k)}$ *then* $t^{(k)}(\xi) = t^{(k+1)}(\xi')$ *where* $\pi_{k+1}(\xi') = \xi$.

   That is, it is possible to identify the points in the E-singular loci

   $$\text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)}, c), \ldots, \text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)}, c)$$

   and outside the centers $Z^{(0)}, \ldots, Z^{(k)}$, *with their corresponding transforms in the E-singular locus* $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(k+1)}, c)$.

2. *The E-resolution is achieved by means of transformations along centers* $\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)}$ *for* $0 \leq k \leq r-1$. *The E-resolution function t drops after each one of these transformations*

   $$max\ t^{(0)} > max\ t^{(1)} > \ldots > max\ t^{(r-1)}.$$

3. *For all* $0 \leq k \leq r-1$, *the closed set* $\text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)}$ *is equidimensional and regular and its dimension is determined by the value max* $t^{(k)}$.

Proof. These properties come from the previous results. ☐

Remark 5.10. Running this algorithm 5.6 of E-resolution of a BBOE we only modify the singular points included in the E-singular locus.

6 Log-resolution of binomial ideals

6.1 Locally monomial resolution of a binomial ideal

6.1. Let $(W^{(0)}, (J^{(0)}, c), H^{(0)}, E^{(0)})$ be a BBOE. By algorithm 5.6 there exists an index r such that $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(r)}, c) = \emptyset$ where $J^{(r)} = J_n^{(r)} = M_n^{(r)} \cdot I_n^{(r)}$.

If $\text{E-ord}(I_n^{(r)}) = 0$ and $I_n^{(r)} = 1$ the resolution process is finished. But if $I_n^{(r)} \neq 1$ then it is necessary to modify the part of the singular locus included in the hyperbolic hypersurfaces which contain $V(I_n^{(r)})$.

Let $\{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$ be the reduced Gröbner basis of $J^{(0)}$ in $W^{(0)}$. Let $\xi \in W^{(r)}$ be a point. In a neighborhood of ξ, set $I_n^{(r)} =< f_1, \ldots, f_m >$ where f_j comes from the transforms of the generator g_j of the Gröbner basis of $J^{(0)}$ by the sequence of blow ups. At $W^{(r)}$ construct the ideal

$$\tilde{I}_n^{(r)} = (Nhyp(I_n^{(r)}))_y = (< \{f_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,m} / \text{ E-ord}_\xi(f_i) \neq 0\ \forall\ \xi \in W^{(r)} >)_y \subset K[x, y]_y$$

where $Nhyp(I_n^{(r)})$ denotes the ideal generated by the non hyperbolic generators of $I_n^{(r)}$.

Before passing to the localization, it is necessary to rewrite as y the variables x appearing in the hyperbolic generators of $I_n^{(r)}$.

If $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)} \neq 0$ then by construction $\text{E-ord}_\xi(\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}) > 0$ for all $\xi \in W^{(r)}$. Now resolve the binomial pair $(\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}, c)$, where c is the corresponding critical value.

Remark 6.2. The construction of the ideal $\tilde{I}$ depends on the choice of the system of generators of I. This is because it is necessary to fix a Gröbner basis of $J^{(0)}$ from the beginning of the resolution process.

Example 6.3. Let $I =< 1 - x_1, x_2 - x_3^2 > \subset K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ be a binomial ideal, $char(K) = 0$. Let $\{1 - x_1, x_2 - x_3^2\}$ and $\{1 - x_1, x_2 - x_3^2 x_1\}$ be two systems of generators of I.

Note that $< x_2 - x_3^2 > \neq < x_2 - x_3^2 y_1 >$ in $K[y_1, x_2, x_3]_{y_1}$.

Algorithm 6.4. Locally monomial resolution.

Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal without hyperbolic equations, with respect to a normal crossing divisor E. Fix a reduced Gröbner basis of J. Consider $J = M \cdot I$. At the beginning $\mathcal{O}_W = K[x]$, $E = \{V(x_1), \ldots, V(x_n)\}$ and $J = I$.

Consider the BBOE $(W, (J, c), H, E)$, where H is the set of exceptional hypersurfaces. At the beginning $H = \emptyset$.

1. Apply the algorithm 5.6 to $(W, (J, c), H, E)$, where $c = \max \text{E-ord}(J) > 0$. Obtain $J' = M' \cdot I'$ with $\text{E-Sing}(J', c) = \emptyset$.
2. If $\max \text{E-ord}(I') = 0$
   - If $I' = 1$ finish. J' principal.
   - If $I' \neq 1$ take $\tilde{I}$ in $K[x, y]_y$.
     - If $\tilde{I} \neq 0$ take $J = \tilde{I}$ and go to step 1.
     - If $\tilde{I} = 0$ finish. The ideal I' is given only by hyperbolic equations.
3. If $\max \text{E-ord}(I') > 0$ take $J = J'$ and go to step 1.

Remark 6.5. Step (1) of algorithm 6.4 means modify the singular points in $\text{E-Sing}(J, c)$. During this step the number of invertible variables y does not increase, since the ideal $\tilde{I}$ is constructed when the E-singular locus is empty.

Proposition 6.6. *The next combinatorial center to be blown up defined by $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}$ (6.1) at $W^{(r)}$ is compatible with the centers defined at other charts.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume r is the first stage of the E-resolution process where it is necessary to define an ideal $\tilde{I}$. Denote by $x_1', \ldots, x_n'$ the variables after blowing up.

At some affine chart $W_i^{(r)}$, let assume the ideal $J^{(r)} = J_n^{(r)} = M^{(r)} \cdot I^{(r)}$ can be written as $J^{(r)} =< f_{i,1}^{(r)}, \ldots, f_{i,s}^{(r)} >$ where each $f_{i,j}^{(r)} = M^{(r)} \cdot g_{i,j}^{(r)}$. By hypothesis, there exists some $g_{i,j}^{(r)}$ which is a hyperbolic equation and $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)} \neq 0$.

Any other chart with different conditions will be treated before or after $W_i^{(r)}$:

- At some affine chart $W_j^{(l)}$, where $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(l)}, c_l) \neq \emptyset$ we consider the center determined by the E-resolution function.
- At some affine chart $W_j^{(t)}$, where $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(t)}, c_t) = \emptyset$
  - and $c_t \neq c$. If $c_t > c$ then $W_j^{(t)}$ is the next chart to be considered, otherwise, consider $W_i^{(r)}$.
  - and $c_t = c$. If $\text{E-ord}(I_n^{(t)}) > 0$ then at this chart it is still possible to drop the value of c_t.
    If $\text{E-ord}(I_n^{(t)}) = 0$ and $I_n^{(t)} = 1$ the resolution process is already finished at this chart.
    If $\text{E-ord}(I_n^{(t)}) = 0$, $I_n^{(t)} \neq 1$ and $\tilde{I}_n^{(t)} = 0$ the E-resolution process is finished at this chart.

So it is enough to check the assumption in the case of having two such charts. That is, there exists another affine chart $W_k^{(m)}$ such that $\text{E-Sing}(J^{(m)}, c) = \emptyset$, $\text{E-ord}(I_n^{(m)}) = 0$, $I_n^{(m)} \neq 1$ and $\tilde{I}_n^{(m)} \neq 0$. Under these conditions, the ideal $J^{(m)} = M^{(m)} \cdot I^{(m)}$ can be written $J^{(m)} =< f_{k,1}^{(m)}, \ldots, f_{k,s}^{(m)} >$ where each $f_{k,j}^{(m)} = M^{(m)} \cdot g_{k,j}^{(m)}$. Some $g_{k,j}^{(m)}$ is a hyperbolic equation and $\tilde{I}_n^{(m)} \neq 0$.

Suppose $g_{i,1}^{(r)}$ is a hyperbolic equation in $W_i^{(r)}$, then $\max \text{E-ord}(g_{i,1}^{(r)}) = 0$. The following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & W_i^{(r)} = Spec(K[x'_1 \dots, x'_n]_{\{x'_l | l \in B_i\}}) \arrow[dll] & B_i \subset \{1, \dots, n\} & g_{i,1}^{(r)} \\
W = Spec(K[x_1 \dots, x_n]) & & W_i^{(r)} \cap W_k^{(m)} = Spec(K[x'_1 \dots, x'_n]_{\{x'_l | l \in B\}}) \arrow[u] \arrow[d] & B \supset B_i \cup B_k & \updownarrow \\
 & & W_k^{(m)} = Spec(K[x'_1 \dots, x'_n]_{\{x'_l | l \in B_k\}}) \arrow[ull] & B_k \subset \{1, \dots, n\} & g_{k,1}^{(m)}
\end{tikzcd}$$

(1) If $\max \text{E-ord}(g_{k,1}^{(m)}) > 0$ in $W_k^{(m)}$, look to the points in the intersection $W_i^{(r)} \cap W_k^{(m)}$.

At each point of $W_i^{(r)} \cap W_k^{(m)}$, $\text{E-ord}(g_{k,1}^{(m)}) = 0$ since $g_{k,1}^{(m)}$ is the first generator of $I_n^{(m)}$ and its E-order is zero in $W_i^{(r)}$.

(2) If $\max \text{E-ord}(g_{k,1}^{(m)}) = 0$ then we construct $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}$ and $\tilde{I}_n^{(m)}$ at both charts, erasing the first generator $g_{i,1}^{(r)}$ respectively $g_{k,1}^{(m)}$. Continue the argument with the remaining generators.

If r is not the first stage of the E-resolution process where it is necessary to define an ideal $\tilde{I}$, then the ideals $I_n^{(r)}$ and $I_n^{(m)}$ can have different number of generators. But in this situation, there was a hyperbolic generator at a previous stage of the E-resolution process. Therefore, as above, at each point of the intersection of these charts both generators are erased. □

Claim 6.7. The ideal $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}$ can be non well defined in the intersection of two charts.

6.8. In such case, to construct $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}$ and $\tilde{I}_n^{(m)}$, at each chart erase the hyperbolic generators of $I_n^{(r)}$ and $I_n^{(m)}$, respectively.

In the intersection $U_{i,k} = W_i^{(r)} \cap W_k^{(m)}$ we must consider $\widetilde{\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}|_{U_{i,k}}}$ and $\widetilde{\tilde{I}_n^{(m)}|_{U_{i,k}}}$. That is, erase the hyperbolic generators at each chart, and then consider the ideals restricted to $W_i^{(r)} \cap W_k^{(m)}$. Erase the hyperbolic generators in $\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}|_{U_{i,k}}$ and in $\tilde{I}_n^{(m)}|_{U_{i,k}}$. Note that in these two steps the same generators are erased in both ideals $I_n^{(r)}$ and $I_n^{(m)}$. Hence

$$\widetilde{\tilde{I}_n^{(r)}|_{U_{i,k}}} \equiv \widetilde{\tilde{I}_n^{(m)}|_{U_{i,k}}}.$$

Remark 6.9. Defining this ideal $\tilde{I}_n$ and considering $J_n = \tilde{I}_n$ in the algorithm 6.4 the following sequence of inclusions is achieved

$$Z \subset \cdots \subset \text{E-top}(P_i) \subset \text{E-top}(J_i, c_{i+1}) \subset \text{E-top}(P_{i+1}) \subset \cdots \subset \text{E-top}(P_n) \subset \text{E-top}(\tilde{I}_n, \tilde{c}_{n+1})$$

where $\tilde{c}_{n+1}$ is the suitable critical value. It holds $\text{E-top}(J_i, c_{i+1}) \subset \text{E-top}(P_{i+1})$ since $J_i = \text{E-Coeff}(P_{i+1})$.

When $\max \text{E-ord}(I_i) = 0$ in dimension $i < n$, this chain is not achieved since $\text{E-top}(J_i, c_{i+1}) = \text{E-top}(M_i, c_{i+1})$. This is the reason to use Γ function. In that case

$$Z \subset \text{E-top}(J_i, c_{i+1}) \subset \text{E-top}(P_{i+1}) \subset \cdots .$$

Remark 6.10. As a consequence $Z \subset \text{E-top}(I_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, since by construction of the companion ideal $\text{E-top}(P_i) \subseteq \text{E-top}(I_i)$.

The algorithm 6.4 provides a *locally monomial resolution*, this means the output is a locally monomial ideal.

Definition 6.11. Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in definition 2.4. A *locally monomial resolution* of J is a sequence of blow ups along combinatorial centers $Z^{(k)}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(W,H) & (W^{(1)},H^{(1)}) \arrow[l, "\Pi_1"'] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\Pi_2"'] & (W^{(N)},H^{(N)}) \arrow[l, "\Pi_N"'] \\
J & J\mathcal{O}_{W^{(1)}} & \cdots & J\mathcal{O}_{W^{(N)}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that

- each center $Z^{(k)}$ has normal crossings with the exceptional divisors $H^{(k)} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_k\}$. In fact, $Z^{(k)} = \cap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} H_i$ where $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$,
- the total transform of J at (each affine chart of) $W^{(N)}$ is of the form

  $$J\mathcal{O}_{W^{(N)}} =< \mathtt{M}_1 \cdot (1-\mu_1 y^{\delta_1}), \mathtt{M}_2 \cdot (1-\mu_2 y^{\delta_2}), \ldots, \mathtt{M}_r \cdot (1-\mu_r y^{\delta_r}), \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} > \subset K[x,y]_y \quad (19)$$

  with $\mathtt{M}_i = I(H_1)^{b_{i_1}} \cdot \ldots \cdot I(H_N)^{b_{i_N}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r+1$ where $H^{(N)} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_N\}$, $b_j \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq N$, and $\mu_i \in K$, $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. And where $\epsilon = 1$ if some generator of J is a monomial, and $\epsilon = 0$ otherwise.

6.12. It is necessary to check that the ideal (19) is locally a monomial ideal with respect to a regular system of parameters.

Assume $K[x,y]_y = K[x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-s}]_y$. Let $a \in Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ be a point, then $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ with $a_i \neq 0$ for all $s+1 \leq i \leq n$. There is a natural morphism

$$K[x,y]_y \to K[x,y]_a = \mathcal{O}_{Spec(K[x,y]_y),a} \to \widehat{K[x,y]}_a$$

where $\widehat{K[x,y]}_a$ is the completion of the local ring at the point a, denoted by $K[x,y]_a$.

Remark 6.13. When $\tilde{I}$ is constructed, the monomial part is not taken into account. Then the monomials $\mathtt{M}_i$ of the total transform (19) can contain some variables x_j which have turned into y_j later in the E-resolution process, but they have not been rewritten as y_j in these monomials.

In the neighborhood of a point ξ such that $\xi_j = 0$, the hyperbolic equations containing y_j disappear, are equal to 1, so the total transform is written

$$J\mathcal{O}_{W^{(N)}} =< \mathtt{M}_1 \cdot (1-\mu_1 y^{\delta_1}), \ldots, \mathtt{M}_l \cdot (1-\mu_l y^{\delta_l}), \mathtt{M}_{l+1}, \ldots, \mathtt{M}_r, \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} >$$

with $l < r$, and $\mathtt{M}_i$ can contain the variable x_j. After some combinatorial blow ups,

$$J\mathcal{O}_{W^{(N_1)}} =< \mathtt{M}'_1 \cdot (1-\mu_1 y^{\delta_1}), \ldots, \mathtt{M}'_l \cdot (1-\mu_l y^{\delta_l}), \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M} > .$$

On the other hand, let $a \in Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ be a point where $a_j \neq 0$. Then, in the neighborhood of a, y_j is a unit. If the hyperbolic equations vanish at a, the variables y_j in the monomial part are units in the local ring $K[x,y]_y$. Thus, we can assume $\mathtt{M}_i = x^{\beta_i}$, $\beta_i \in \mathbb{N}^s$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r+1$.

Proposition 6.14. *Let $J \subset K[x,y]_y$ be a binomial ideal of the form*

$$J =< \mathtt{M}_1 \cdot (1-\mu_1 y^{\delta_1}), \ldots, \mathtt{M}_r \cdot (1-\mu_r y^{\delta_r}), \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} > \subset K[x,y]_y \quad (20)$$

where $\mathtt{M}_i = x^{\beta_i}$ with $\beta_i \in \mathbb{N}^s$ for $1 \leq i \leq r+1$, and $\mu_i \in K$, $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-s}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$, $\epsilon = 0, 1$.

If $J \neq 1$, for all $a \in Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ there exist local coordinates $\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\} \in \widehat{K[x,y]}_a$ such that

$$J \cdot \widehat{K[x,y]}_a =< z^{\lambda_1}, \ldots, z^{\lambda_t} > \quad (21)$$

where $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{N}^n$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$, and $t \leq \min(r+1, n)$.

Proof. By induction on the dimension of the ambient space:

- If $n = 1$, there is only one variable. Denote it by x_1 or y_1 depending on the considered point.

  In this way, in the neighborhood of a point $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^1_K$ such that $\xi = \xi_1 = 0$ the ideal J is of the form $J_\xi =< \mathtt{M}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{M}_r, \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} >$ where $\mathtt{M}_i = x_1^{\beta_i}$, $\beta_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $J_\xi =< x_1^{\beta} >$ with $\beta = g.c.d(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1})$.

  If $\xi = \xi_1 \neq 0$ then the monomials $\mathtt{M}_i = 1$. Therefore $J_\xi =< 1 - \mu_1 y_1^{\delta_1}, \ldots, 1 - \mu_r y_1^{\delta_r} >$ with $\mu_i \in K$, $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, whereas $J_\xi \neq 1$ $(\epsilon = 0)$.

  The ideal J_ξ can be rewritten as $J_\xi =< 1 - \eta_1 y_1^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, 1 - \eta_r y_1^{\alpha_r} >$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta_i \in K$, since all its generators are hyperbolic equations in one variable y_1.

  Set $\alpha = g.c.d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r)$. Let check $J_\xi =< 1 - \mu y_1^{\alpha} >$ with $\mu \in K$.

  Assume $\alpha_1 > \ldots > \alpha_r$. If $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$ for any $i \neq j$ with $\eta_i \neq \eta_j$ then $J_\xi = 1$ since

  $$(1 - \eta_i y_1^{\alpha_i}) - (1 - \eta_j y_1^{\alpha_i}) = (\eta_j - \eta_i) y_1^{\alpha_i} \in J_\xi.$$

  Since $\alpha_1 > \ldots > \alpha_r$, can be easily checked that the ideal J_ξ can be expressed

  $$J_\xi =< 1 - \eta_1 y_1^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, 1 - \eta_r y_1^{\alpha_r} >=< 1 - \frac{\eta_1}{\eta_r} y_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_r}, \ldots, 1 - \frac{\eta_{r-1}}{\eta_r} y_1^{\alpha_{r-1} - \alpha_r}, 1 - \eta_r y_1^{\alpha_r} > \quad (22)$$

  Now back to rearrange the exponents and make the same operation as in equation (22). That is, argue as in the Euclidean algorithm for computing the greatest common divisor, always subtracting the smaller exponent. So

  $$J_\xi =< 1 - \nu_1 y_1^{\alpha}, \ldots, 1 - \nu_r y_1^{\alpha} >$$

  with $\alpha = g.c.d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r)$, $\nu_i \in K$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

  As we have seen above, it is necessary $\nu_1 = \ldots = \nu_r = \mu$ to achieve $J_\xi \neq 1$. Then either $J_\xi = 1$ or $J_\xi =< 1 - \mu y_1^{\alpha} >$.

  If $char(K) = p > 0$ and $J_\xi \neq 1$, set $\alpha = p^s \alpha'$ with $\alpha' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha' \not\equiv 0 \ mod \ p$ and $\mu = (\mu')^{p^s}$, $\mu' \in K$, so $1 - \mu y_1^{\alpha} = (1 - \mu' y_1^{\alpha'})^{p^s}$. Set $z_1 = 1 - \mu' y_1^{\alpha'}$, therefore $J_\xi =< z_1^{p^s} >$.

- Assume the result holds for a binomial ideal of this form (20) in $n - 1$ variables.

  Let J_ξ be a binomial ideal as in (20) in n variables. In addition, assume that $\mathtt{M}_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r + 1$, have no common factors. Otherwise $J_\xi = M \cdot J_1$ where J_1 is of the same form as J_ξ without common factors.

  When $char(K) = p > 0$, let $\delta_i = p^{l_i} \delta_i'$ with $\delta_i' \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-s}$, $l_i \geq 0$, so that for all $1 \leq i \leq r$ there exists some j, $1 \leq j \leq n - s$ such that $\delta'_{i_j} \not\equiv 0 \ mod \ p$. Suppose $l_1 \leq l_i$ for all $i = 2, \ldots, r$, then

  $$J_\xi =< \mathtt{M}_1 \cdot (1 - \mu_1' y^{\delta_1'})^{p^{l_1}}, \mathtt{M}_2 \cdot (1 - \mu_2 y^{\delta_2}), \ldots, \mathtt{M}_r \cdot (1 - \mu_r y^{\delta_r}), \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} >$$

  where $(\mu_1')^{p^{l_1}} = \mu_1$. Define $\eta_1 = \mu_1'$ and $\alpha_1 = \delta_1' = (\alpha_{1_1}, \ldots, \alpha_{1_{n-s}})$. Thus $1 - \mu_1' y^{\delta_1'} = 1 - \eta_1 y^{\alpha_1}$ where $\alpha_{1_j} \not\equiv 0 \ mod \ p$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n - s$. Suppose $j = 1$, so $\alpha_{1_1} \not\equiv 0 \ mod \ p$.

  Set $z_1 = 1 - \eta_1 y^{\alpha_1}$. Formally

  $$y_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}} (1 - z_1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \cdot y_2^{\frac{-\alpha_{1_2}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \ldots y_{n-s}^{\frac{-\alpha_{1_{n-s}}}{\alpha_{1_1}}}.$$

Replacing y_1 in the other equations

$$J_\xi =< \mathtt{M}_1 \cdot z_1^{p^{l_1}}, \mathtt{M}_2 \cdot \left(1 - \mu_2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1} \right)^{\frac{\delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} (1-z_1)^{\frac{\delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \cdot y_2^{\delta_{2_2} - \frac{\alpha_{1_2} \cdot \delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \dots y_{n-s}^{\delta_{2_{n-s}} - \frac{\alpha_{1_{n-s}} \cdot \delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \right), \dots$$

$$\dots, \mathtt{M}_r \cdot \left(1 - \mu_r \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1} \right)^{\frac{\delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} (1-z_1)^{\frac{\delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \cdot y_2^{\delta_{r_2} - \frac{\alpha_{1_2} \cdot \delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \dots y_{n-s}^{\delta_{r_{n-s}} - \frac{\alpha_{1_{n-s}} \cdot \delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \right), \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} > .$$

Note that $y_i, (1-z_1) \in \widehat{K[x,y]_a}$ are units. Since $\alpha_{1_1} \not\equiv 0 \ mod\ p$ then $y_i^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}, (1-z_1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \in \widehat{K[x,y]_a}$, so that this ideal belongs to the following extension of $K[x,y]_y$, inside the completion

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K[x,y]_y \arrow[r] & K[x, y_2, \dots, y_{n-s}, y_2^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}, \dots, y_{n-s}^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}]_{y, y^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}}[[z_1]] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \widehat{K[x,y]_a} \\
 & K[x, y_2^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}, \dots, y_{n-s}^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}]_{y^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}}[[z_1]] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $y^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}} = \{ y_2^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}, \dots, y_{n-s}^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \}$.

Passing to the quotient $K[x, y_2^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}, \dots, y_{n-s}^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}]_{y^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}}[[z_1]] / < z_1 >$

$$\overline{J_\xi} =< \mathtt{M}_2 \cdot \left(1 - \mu_2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1} \right)^{\frac{\delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} y_2^{\delta_{2_2} - \frac{\alpha_{1_2} \cdot \delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \dots y_{n-s}^{\delta_{2_{n-s}} - \frac{\alpha_{1_{n-s}} \cdot \delta_{2_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \right), \dots$$

$$\dots, \mathtt{M}_r \cdot \left(1 - \mu_r \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1} \right)^{\frac{\delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} y_2^{\delta_{r_2} - \frac{\alpha_{1_2} \cdot \delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \dots y_{n-s}^{\delta_{r_{n-s}} - \frac{\alpha_{1_{n-s}} \cdot \delta_{r_1}}{\alpha_{1_1}}} \right), \epsilon \cdot \mathtt{M}_{r+1} > .$$

So that $\overline{J_\xi} \subset K[x, y_2^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}, \dots, y_{n-s}^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}]_{y^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{1_1}}}}$. By induction hypothesis $\overline{J_\xi}$ is of the desired form. □

Remark 6.15. The ideal $J_a =< z^{\lambda_1}, \dots, z^{\lambda_t} > \subset \widehat{K[x,y]_a}$ can be written in this form in a ètale neighborhood of the point a, denoted by $U_{z,a}$. Note that

$$Spec(\widehat{K[x,y]_a}) \subset U_{z,a} \subset Spec(K[x,y]_y)$$

and $\mathcal{O}_{U_{z,a}}$ is a finite extension of $K[x,y]_y$.

In the intersection of two such ètale neighborhoods $U_{z,a_1} \cap U_{z,a_2}$, it holds $J_{a_1} = J_{a_2}$.

Proposition 6.16. *Let $J \subset K[x,y]_y$ be a binomial ideal as in (20). The local writing given by proposition 6.14 is invariant by the torus action.*

Proof. In the neighborhood of a point $\xi \in U_{z,\xi} \subset Spec(K[x,y]_y)$, if the ideal $J \cdot \widehat{K[x,y]_\xi}$ is of the form

$$J \cdot \widehat{K[x,y]_\xi} =< z^{\lambda_1}, \dots, z^{\lambda_t} >$$

then in a neighborhood of the point $\mathcal{T}^d(\xi) \in Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ there exist local coordinates $\{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ in $\widehat{K[x,y]_{\mathcal{T}^d(\xi)}}$ such that $J \cdot \widehat{K[x,y]_{\mathcal{T}^d(\xi)}} =< w^{\lambda_1}, \dots, w^{\lambda_t} >$.

It is enough to note that if $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ then $\mathcal{T}^d(\xi) = (t^{a_1}\xi_1, \dots, t^{a_n}\xi_n)$, with $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. □

Corollary 6.17. *The locally monomial resolution given by algorithm 6.4 is invariant by the torus action.*

Remark 6.18. Note that the monomials z^{λ_i} generating the ideal of equation (21) in proposition 6.14 are supported on the union of the exceptional divisors (coming from the E-resolution process) and the irreducible components of the original binomial variety given by the ideal J.

Remark 6.19. At the beginning we consider binomial varieties which can not be described globally by a monomial ideal.

6.2 Log-resolution

Given a binomial ideal J, the algorithm 6.4 provides a locally monomial resolution of J. Our aim is to achieve a log-resolution of J. The step from the locally monomial resolution to the log-resolution modifies the singular points included in the hyperbolic hypersurfaces.

Remark 6.20. To transform a locally monomial ideal into an exceptional monomial ideal it can be applied:

A) The algorithm by Goward [13].

B) Villamayor algorithm of resolution of singularities (over fields of characteristic zero), adapted to the case of an ideal generated by monomials. In this case the algorithm works over a field of arbitrary characteristic.

C) The algorithm by Bierstone and Milman constructed in [3] to resolve ideals generated by monomials.

D) The algorithm 5.6 of E-resolution of BBOE. In this case, the resolution achieved is invariant by the torus action.

6.21. Note that algorithm 5.6 of E-resolution of BBOE can be applied to a BBOE whose ideal is generated by monomials. This is because in the neighborhood of a point $\xi \in Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ there exists a ètale neighborhood $U_{z,\xi}$ of ξ such that the extension $K[x,y]_y \subset \mathcal{O}_{U_{z,\xi}}$ is finite.

Then, apply algorithm 5.6 (in the ètale neighborhood $U_{z,\xi}$) to the ideal $J_\xi \subset \mathcal{O}_{U_{z,\xi}}$ which is a monomial ideal in $\{z_1,\dots,z_n\}$. The centers to be blown up are combinatorial in z, and in terms of variables x,y, they are intersections of hyperbolic hypersurfaces and coordinate hypersurfaces.

In this case, the normal crossing divisor to be fixed, denoted by E^*, is $E^* = \{V(z_1),\dots,V(z_n)\}$. Recall that for ideals given by monomials, the E-order function is the usual order function.

Corollary 6.22. Log-resolution

Let $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ be a binomial ideal as in 2.4, without hyperbolic equations, respect to a normal crossing divisor E. Algorithm 6.4 provides a locally monomial resolution of J.

Option D of remark 6.20 gives a log-resolution *of J, that is, a sequence of blow ups at regular centers*

$$(W,H,E) \leftarrow (W^{(1)},H^{(1)},E^{(1)}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow (W^{(r)},H^{(r)},E^{(r)}) \approx (U_z,\emptyset,E^*) \leftarrow$$

$$\leftarrow (W^{(r+1)},H^{(r+1)},E^{(r+1)}) = (U_z^{(1)},H^{(r+1)},(E^*)^{(1)}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow (W^{(N)},H^{(N)},E^{(N)})$$

such that

- *each center $Z^{(k)}$ has normal crossings with the exceptional divisors $H^{(k)}$*

- *the total transform of J in $W^{(N)}$ is of the form*

$$J\mathcal{O}_{W^{(N)}} = I(H_1)^{b_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot I(H_m)^{b_m}$$

with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $b_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $H^{(N)} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$.

Proof. Algorithm 6.4 provides a locally monomial resolution of J. By proposition 6.14 rewrite the resulting ideal. So that locally, in a ètale neighborhood, algorithm 5.6 can be applied.

This means it is possible to apply algorithm 6.4 again. But there is a substantial difference, if after some blow ups we achieve $J' = M' \cdot I'$ then

$$max\ \text{E-ord}(I') = max\ \text{ord}(I') = 0 \Leftrightarrow I' = 1$$

hence this gives a log-resolution of J. □

7 Embedded desingularization

Lemma 7.1. *Let X be a closed subscheme of $W = Spec(K[x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-s}]_y) \subset \mathbb{A}^n_K$. The ideal $I(X)$ is a binomial ideal as in 2.4, without monomial generators, respect to a normal crossing divisor $E = \{V(x_1), \ldots, V(x_s), V(y_1), \ldots, V(y_{n-s})\} = E_x \sqcup E_y$ where $E_x = \{V(x_1), \ldots, V(x_s)\}$, $E_y = \{V(y_1), \ldots, V(y_{n-s})\}$.*

Let $\text{Reg}_{\text{E}}(X) = \{\xi \in X |\ X$ *is regular at* ξ *and has normal crossings with* $E\}$ *be the* regular locus of X along E, *then*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{E}}(X) \cap E_x = \emptyset.$$

Note that $X \cap E_y = \emptyset$ since $X \subset W = Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ and $E \cap Spec(K[x,y]_y) = E_x$.

Proof. If $\xi \in X \subset Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ then $y(\xi) \neq 0$. Thus $\xi \notin L$ for all $L \in E_y$, moreover if $\xi \in V \in E$ then $\xi \in E_x$.

Let $\xi \in X$ be a point such that X is regular at ξ and $\xi \in V = V(x_i) \in E_x$. Then $\xi_i = 0$ and there exists a generator $f(x,y) = y^\gamma x^\alpha - bx^\beta \in I(X)$ as in (2) such that $f(\xi) = 0$ and $\alpha_i > 0$ or $\beta_i > 0$.

If $\alpha_i > 0$ it holds $f(x,y) = y^\gamma x_i^{\alpha_i} x^{\alpha^*} - bx^\beta$ with $\alpha^* = \alpha - (0, \ldots, 0, \alpha_i, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}^s$. By the Jacobian criterion X has no normal crossings with $V(x_i)$ at ξ. Therefore X has no normal crossings with E at ξ. Analogously for $\beta_i > 0$.

If there is not any generator of $I(X)$ under these conditions then the variable x_i can be eliminated. Consider the same problem in dimension $n-1$. □

Corollary 7.2. *Let X be a closed subscheme of $W = Spec(K[x,y]_y)$ where $I(X)$ is a binomial ideal as in 2.4, without monomial generators, respect to a normal crossing divisor E.*

If $\xi \in \text{Reg}_{\text{E}}(X)$ then in a neighborhood of ξ

$$I(X)_\xi = < 1 - \mu_1 y^{\delta_1}, \ldots, 1 - \mu_r y^{\delta_r} >$$

where $\mu_i \in K$, $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-s}$, for some $r \geq 1$.

Proof. By lemma 7.1 it holds $I(X)_\xi \subset K[y]_y$. The variables x do not vanish at ξ, then $I(X)_\xi$ is a binomial ideal in terms of the variables y. □

As a consequence, the following property of algorithm 6.4 holds.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $(W, (J, c), H, E)$ be a BBOE such that J is the ideal of a regular subvariety X along E of pure dimension, $H = \emptyset$ and $c = 1$, then the resolution function t is constant.*

Note that t is defined here by means of option D of remark 6.20.

Proof. Assume $dim(X) = n$ and J is a binomial ideal as in 2.4 generated only by binomials. If $\xi \in X$ then X has normal crossings with E at ξ. Hence, by lemma 7.1 $\xi \notin V$ for all hypersurface $V \in E_x$, in order to avoid tangency. Then, in a neighborhood of ξ,

$$I(X)_\xi =< 1 - \mu_1 y^{\delta_1}, \ldots, 1 - \mu_r y^{\delta_r} >$$

where $\mu_i \in K$, $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-s}$, for some $r \geq 1$, and the E-order of this ideal is zero at all points of the neighborhood.

Applying algorithm 6.4, in the first step $\widetilde{I(X)_\xi} = 0$ since $I(X)_\xi$ is already a locally monomial ideal.

The subvariety X is regular at the point ξ, so at least one of these hyperbolic equations is not a p-th power of the characteristic $p = char(K)$. Argue as in the proof of 6.14 we can write

$$I(X)_\xi =< z_1, 1 - \mu_2^*(1 - z_1)^{\alpha_2} y^{\delta_2^*}, \ldots, 1 - \mu_r^*(1 - z_1)^{\alpha_r} y^{\delta_r^*} >$$

where $\mu_i^* \in K$, $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\delta_i^* \in \mathbb{Q}^{n-s}$ with $\delta_{i_1}^* = 0$ for all i.

By induction $I(X)_\xi =< z_1, \ldots, z_l >$ for some $l \leq n$ where $\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$ are local coordinates in the completion of the local ring at the point ξ.

Then, along $\{V(z_1), \ldots, V(z_n)\}$ it holds

$$t(\xi) = (\overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{l}, \infty, \ldots, \infty).$$

This argument works for every regular point $\xi \in X$. Since all the components of X have the same dimension, there are always l coordinates equal to 1 at the resolution function. Therefore t is constant. □

Theorem 7.4. Embedded desingularization

Let $X \subset W = Spec(K[x, y]_y)$ be a closed reduced subscheme where $I(X)$ is a binomial ideal as in 2.4, generated only by binomials with respect to a normal crossing divisor $E = E_x \sqcup E_y$.

Then there exists a sequence of transformations of pairs

$$(W, H = \emptyset) \leftarrow (W^{(1)}, H^{(1)}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow (W^{(N)}, H^{(N)})$$

which induces a proper birational morphism $\Pi : W^{(N)} \to W$ such that

1. *The morphism Π restricted to the regular locus of X along E, defines an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Reg_E}(X) \cong \Pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg_E}(X)) \subset W^{(N)}.$$

2. *$X^{(N)}$, the strict transform of X in $W^{(N)}$, is regular and has normal crossings with $H^{(N)}$.*

3. Equivariance*: If there is a torus action on $(X \subset W, H)$ then there is also a torus action on $(X^{(N)} \subset W^{(N)}, H^{(N)})$.*

Proof. Let $(W^{(0)},(J^{(0)},1),H^{(0)},E^{(0)})$ be a binomial basic object along $E^{(0)}$, where $W^{(0)}=W$, $J^{(0)}=I(X)$, $H^{(0)}=\emptyset$ and $E^{(0)}=E$. Note that

$$\text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)},1)=\{\xi\in W^{(0)}|\ \text{E-ord}_\xi(J^{(0)})\geq 1\}=X\cap E_x\subset X=Sing(J^{(0)},1).$$

By lemma 7.1, $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)\cap E_x=\emptyset$ then

$$\text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)},1)\cap\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)=\emptyset$$

Therefore when we apply the algorithm 5.6 to the BBOE $(W^{(0)},(J^{(0)},1),H^{(0)},E^{(0)})$ and we blow up along $Z^{(0)}\subset\text{E-Sing}(J^{(0)},1)$ the points at $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)$ are never modified.

Hence, setting $c=1$ and applying algorithm 6.4, we achieve a locally monomial resolution of $(W^{(0)},(J^{(0)},1),H^{(0)},E^{(0)})$. This means a sequence of blow ups along combinatorial centers $Z^{(k)}$

$$\begin{tikzcd}[row sep=tiny]
(W^{(0)},(J^{(0)},1),H^{(0)},E^{(0)}) & (W^{(1)},(J^{(1)},1),H^{(1)},E^{(1)}) \arrow[l, "\pi_1"'] & \dots \arrow[l, "\pi_2"'] & (W^{(r)},(J^{(r)},1),H^{(r)},E^{(r)}) \arrow[l, "\pi_r"'] \\
J^{(0)} & J^{(0)}\mathcal{O}_{W^{(1)}} & \cdots & J^{(0)}\mathcal{O}_{W^{(r)}} \\
\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X) & \pi_1^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)) & \cdots & \pi_r^{-1}(\dots(\pi_1^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)))\dots)
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that

- each center $Z^{(k)}\subset\text{E-Sing}(J^{(k)},1)$ has normal crossings with the exceptional divisors $H^{(k)}=\{H_1,\dots,H_k\}$. In fact $Z^{(k)}=\cap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}H_i$ where $\mathcal{I}\subseteq\{1,\dots,k\}$,
- the total transform of $J^{(0)}$ at (each affine chart of) $W^{(r)}$ is of the form

  $$J^{(0)}\mathcal{O}_{W^{(r)}}=<\mathtt{M}_1\cdot(1-\mu_1y^{\delta_1}),\mathtt{M}_2\cdot(1-\mu_2y^{\delta_2}),\dots,\mathtt{M}_r\cdot(1-\mu_ry^{\delta_r}),\epsilon\cdot\mathtt{M}_{r+1}>$$

  as in (19).

In addition, by the above argument

$$\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)\cong\pi_1^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X))\cong\dots\cong\pi_r^{-1}(\dots(\pi_1^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)))\dots)$$

that is, $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)\cong\pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X))$ where $\pi=\pi_r\circ\dots\circ\pi_1$.

Once the locally monomial resolution is achieved, by proposition 6.14, for all $\xi\in W^{(r)}$ there exist local coordinates $\{z_1,\dots,z_n\}\in\widehat{K[x,y]}_\xi$ such that

$$J^{(0)}\mathcal{O}_{W^{(r)}}\cdot\widehat{K[x,y]}_\xi=<z^{\lambda_1},\dots,z^{\lambda_t}>$$

where $z=(z_1,\dots,z_n)$, $\lambda_i\in\mathbb{N}^n$ for $1\leq i\leq t$, and $t\leq\min(r+1,n)$.

Consider the normal crossing divisor $E^*=\{V(z_1),\dots,V(z_n)\}$ in $W^{(r)}$. Factorize the total transform $J^{(0)}\mathcal{O}_{W^{(r)}}\cdot\widehat{K[x,y]}_\xi=M\cdot Q$ where M is a monomial ideal with support at E^*.

Then, in a ètale neighborhood of the point ξ, $U_{z,\xi}$, consider the BBOE

$$(U_{z,\xi}\subset W^{(r)},(Q,1),\emptyset,E^*).$$

Note that $\text{E-Sing}(Q,1)=\mathrm{Sing}(Q,1)$ since Q is a monomial ideal with respect to $\{z_1,\dots,z_n\}$.

The isomorphism $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)\cong\pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X))$ provides

$$\pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X))\subset\mathrm{Sing}(Q,1)=\text{E-Sing}(Q,1)$$

since the points at $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)$ can not be included in the support of M.

Let $X^{(r)}$ be the strict transform of X in $U_{z,\xi} \subset W^{(r)}$. Then

$$\pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)) \subset X^{(r)}$$

and it is an open dense subset of $X^{(r)}$.

Apply the algorithm 5.6 of E-resolution of BBOE to $(U_{z,\xi}, (Q,1), \emptyset, E^*)$. The output is the following sequence of transformations

$$(U_{z,\xi}, (Q,1), \emptyset, E^*) \overset{\pi_{r+1}}{\longleftarrow} \dots \overset{\pi_N}{\longleftarrow} (W^{(N)}, (J^{(N)},1), H^{(N)}, E^{(N)}) \overset{\pi_{N+1}}{\longleftarrow} \dots$$

$$\dots \overset{\pi_{N_1}}{\longleftarrow} (W^{(N_1)}, (J^{(N_1)},1), H^{(N_1)}, E^{(N_1)})$$

at permissible centers $Z^{(k)} = \text{E-}\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)} = \underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)}$ and such that for some index N_1 this sequence is a resolution, that is, $\mathrm{Sing}(J^{(N_1)}, 1) = \emptyset$.

Observe that $\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)}$ denotes the set $\underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(k)} = \{\xi \in \mathrm{Sing}(J^{(k)},1) |\ t^{(k)}(\xi) = \max t^{(k)}\}$.

By property 7.3, the resolution function at some stage j, with $j < N_1$, $t^{(j)} : \mathrm{Sing}(J^{(j)},1) \to \mathcal{I}_l$ is constant along $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)$, and takes the value

$$(\overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^{l}, \infty, \dots, \infty)$$

where l is the codimension of $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)$.

Since the resolution function drops after blowing up, there exists a unique index N such that *max* $t^{(N)} = (1, \dots, 1, \infty, \dots, \infty)$ and the maximal value of the resolution function for $k < N$ is *max* $t^{(k)} > (1, \dots, 1, \infty, \dots, \infty)$.

Hence $\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X) \cong \Pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X))$ where $\Pi = \pi_N \circ \dots \circ \pi_r \circ \dots \circ \pi_1$ because of, up to now, we only have modified points where the maximal value of the resolution function was strictly bigger than $(1, \dots, 1, \infty, \dots, \infty)$.

Therefore $\Pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)) \subset Z^{(N)} = \underline{\mathbf{Max}}\, t^{(N)}$ and moreover the strict transform of X, $X^{(N)} \subset Z^{(N)}$ then

$$\Pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X)) \subset X^{(N)} \subset Z^{(N)}$$

is an open dense in $X^{(N)}$ having the same codimension as $X^{(N)}$. Hence $X^{(N)} = \bigcup_i C_i$ is a union of connected components C_i of $Z^{(N)}$ such that

$$C_i \subset \overline{\Pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Reg}_{\mathrm{E}}(X))} = X^{(N)}$$

is regular and has normal crossings with $E^{(N)}$. As a consequence, C_i has normal crossings with $H^{(N)} \subset E^{(N)}$, and therefore $X^{(N)}$ is regular and has normal crossings with $H^{(N)}$.

Since algorithm 6.4 is equivariant, this embedded desingularization is also equivariant. □

Remark 7.5. Note that the processes of resolution of singularities of various (local) charts of affine BBOE patch up to form a unique process of resolution of singularities of the non affine BBOE.

Remark 7.6. The different processes of resolution of singularities of charts patch up since the resolution function is a local invariant (remark 4.22) and every center of blowing up is compatible with the centers defined at other charts (proposition 6.6).

References

[1] Angélica Benito and Orlando Villamayor. Monoidal transformations of singularities in positive characteristic, 2008. Preprint. arXiv:0811.4148v2 [math.AG].

[2] Edward Bierstone and Pierre D. Milman. Canonical desingularization in characteristic zero by blowing up the maximum strata of a local invariant. *Invent. Math.*, 128(2):207–302, 1997.

[3] Edward Bierstone and Pierre D. Milman. Desingularization of toric and binomial varieties. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 15(3):443–486, 2006.

[4] Rocío Blanco. Complexity of Villamayor's algorithm in the non exceptional monomial case, 2007. Preprint. arXiv:0704.3416v2 [math.AG]. To appear in *International Journal of Mathematics*.

[5] Rocío Blanco. *Aspectos Algorítmicos en Resolución de Singularidades. Ideales Monomiales y Binomiales*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidad de Valladolid, January 2008. Avalaible at `http://www.singacom.uva.es/~rblanco/thesis/tesis.pdf`.

[6] Ana Bravo and Orlando Villamayor. Hypersurface singularities in positive characteristic and stratification of the singular locus, 2008. Preprint. arXiv:0807.4308v1 [math.AG].

[7] David A. Cox. Toric varieties and toric resolutions. In *Resolution of singularities (Obergurgl, 1997)*, volume 181 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 259–284. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.

[8] David Eisenbud and Bernd Sturmfels. Binomial ideals. *Duke Math. J.*, 84(1):1–45, 1996.

[9] Santiago Encinas and Herwig Hauser. Strong resolution of singularities in characteristic zero. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 77(4):821–845, 2002.

[10] Santiago Encinas and Orlando Villamayor. A course on constructive desingularization and equivariance. In *Resolution of singularities (Obergurgl, 1997)*, volume 181 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 147–227. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.

[11] Santiago Encinas and Orlando Villamayor. Rees algebras and resolution of singularities, 2007. Preprint. arXiv.org:math/0702836.
To appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana.

[12] Pedro Daniel González Pérez and Bernard Teissier. Embedded resolutions of non necessarily normal affine toric varieties. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 334(5):379–382, 2002.

[13] Russell A. Goward, Jr. A simple algorithm for principalization of monomial ideals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(12):4805–4812 (electronic), 2005.

[14] Heisuke Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I, II. *Ann. of Math. (2) 79 (1964), 109–203; Ibid. (2)*, 79:205–326, 1964.

[15] Heisuke Hironaka. Idealistic exponents of singularity. In *Algebraic geometry (J. J. Sylvester Sympos., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md., 1976)*, pages 52–125. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, Md., 1977.

[16] Hiraku Kawanoue. Toward resolution of singularities over a field of positive characteristic. Part I. Foundation; the language of the idealistic filtration. *Publ. RIMS*, 43(3):819–909, 2007.

[17] Hiraku Kawanoue and Kenji Matsuki, 2007. Toward resolution of singularities over a field of positive characteristic (The Kawanoue program) Part II. Basic invariants associated to the idealistic filtration and their properties. Preprint, arXiv:math/0612008v2 [math.AG].

[18] G. Kempf, Finn Faye Knudsen, D. Mumford, and B. Saint-Donat. *Toroidal embeddings. I.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1973. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 339.

[19] Bernard Teissier. Monomial ideals, binomial ideals, polynomial ideals. In *Trends in commutative algebra*, volume 51 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 211–246. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[20] Orlando Villamayor. Constructiveness of Hironaka's resolution. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 22(1):1–32, 1989.

[21] Orlando Villamayor. Patching local uniformizations. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 25(6):629–677, 1992.

[22] Orlando Villamayor. Rees Algebras on Smooth Schemes: Integral Closure and Higher Differential Operators. Preprint. arXiv:math/0606795v1 [math.AC], 2006.

[23] Orlando Villamayor. Hypersurface singularities in positive characteristic. *Adv. Math.*, 213:687–733, 2007.

[24] Jarosław Włodarczyk. Simple Hironaka resolution in characteristic zero. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18(4):779–822 (electronic), 2005.

Rocío Blanco
Departamento de Álgebra, Geometría y Topología
Universidad de Valladolid
rblanco@modulor.arq.uva.es